

PUBLIC LIBRARY

MAY 9 1919

DETROIT.

NOTICE TO READERS: When you finish reading this magazine, place a 1-cent stamp on this notice, mail the magazine, and it will be placed in the hands of our soldiers or sailors destined to proceed overseas. NO WRAPPING. NO ADDRESS.

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

MAY 10, 1919

PRICE TEN CENTS

Caillaux and Jaures

J. C. Walsh

*Staff Correspondent of "America" at the
Peace Conference*

Justice for the Pope

John C. Reville

** Associate Editor of "America"*

The Pallium and Its Significance

J. Harding Fisher

Associate Editor of "America"

Senator Smith's Prussian School

Paul L. Blakely

Associate Editor of "America"

THE AMERICA PRESS

NEW YORK CITY

AMERICA
A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, MAY 10, 1919
VOLUME XXI. No. 5

Published weekly by The America Press,
173 East 83rd Street, New York

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	113-116
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Caillaux and Jaurès—Justice for the Pope—A Catholic College for the People—The Pallium and Its Significance—The Church of St. Sophia.....	117-126
COMMUNICATIONS	126-127
EDITORIALS	
Sandy Macpherson and Ireland—"The Religion of Respectability"—Literature and Materialism—Letters of Naturalization—Vultures Abroad	128-130
LITERATURE	
Fitzgerald and the Tentmaker—Reviews—Books and Authors.....	130-133
EDUCATION	
Senator Smith's Prussian School.....	134-135
SOCIOLOGY	
The Promotion of Citizenship.....	135
NOTE AND COMMENT.....	135-136

The Catholic Mind
Issue for May 8, 1919

**World - Democracy
and the Church**

**Why the Catholic
School Exists**

**On Killing the
Wounded**

THE THREE IN ONE PAMPHLET

5 Cents Per Copy
\$4.00 Per Hundred

THE AMERICA PRESS
173 East 83rd St. New York

A NEW IRISH PAMPHLET

**Ireland's Right
to Freedom**

By MARTIN CONBOY

Speech delivered at the
Banquet of the Friendly
Sons of St. Patrick, in
New York, March 17, 1919

COPIES NOW READY

5 Cents per Copy
\$4.00 per Hundred

THE AMERICA PRESS
173 East 83rd St. New York

**After-War
Pamphlets**

The Pope's War Work
10 cents each

Problems of the Peace
Conference
10 cents each

War, Peace and Labor
5 cents each

The Catholics' Part in
Reconstruction
5 cents each

Some After-War Problems
5 cents each

The Church, the War and
the Community
5 cents each

Labor Problems and the Church
5 cents each

Ozanam's Ideal of Social Work
5 cents each

Special Rates for Quantities

THE AMERICA PRESS
173 East 83rd St., New York

The Irish Issue

Third Revised and Amend-
ed edition of Doctor
Maloney's now
famous articles
which first
appeared
in
AMERICA

Every lover of the principle of
self-determination for small na-
tions should have this pamphlet

Be sure to secure
copies of this epoch-
making pamphlet

**NEEDED NOW
MORE THAN EVER**

Price 10 Cents each
In quantities \$7.00 per hundred

THE AMERICA PRESS
173 East 83rd Street, New York

THE POPE

What has Benedict XV
done during the great
World War?

Can you answer this
question?

If not you should obtain
a copy of

**THE POPE'S
WAR WORK**

Every Church, Camp, College,
School, Priest, Layman, should
have supplies

Price 10 Cents each
In quantities \$6.00 per hundred

THE AMERICA PRESS
173 East 83rd St. New York

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXI. No. 5 }
WHOLE No. 524 }

MAY 10, 1919

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
\$3.00 A YEAR }

Chronicle

The War.—The Italian controversy over Fiume developed several new features during the week. On April 29, the Italian Chamber of Deputies voted confidence in the Orlando Cabinet and sustained the action of Premier Orlando both in upholding the claims of Italy to Fiume and withdrawing from the Paris Conference when these were denied. The vote of confidence was overwhelming, 382 to 40, the latter votes being cast by the Socialists. The government of Fiume declared the city annexed to Italy. Meanwhile at Paris, President Wilson, Premier Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd George went on making peace and receiving the German delegation.

After several contradictory declarations with regard to President Wilson's statement of last week to the Italian people, in which he laid down the reasons why he could not agree to the annexation of Fiume to Italy, it now seems almost certain that the French and English Premiers approved it, but that neither sanctioned its issue at the moment it was made public. Some kind of a rapprochement between Italy and France was rumored but ostensibly and officially, at least, the Council, now of Three, remained firm on the Fiume question at the beginning of the week. Dispatches from Italy gave unmistakable evidence of the heated tone of public opinion, which is especially bitter towards President Wilson. Later dispatches however were more moderate and Premier Orlando's speeches did not take away all hope of a compromise. On May 3, Count Macchi di Celere, the Italian Ambassador to the United States, now in Paris, had a conference with President Wilson. In semi-official circles this was looked upon as a sign that Italy was considering a resumption of her place at the Peace Conference. The following day the Council of Three sent a communication to the Italian Government inviting it to send back its delegates to Paris.

In this country the press is divided on the merits of the Italian controversy. The Republican papers see in the episode another illustration of the President's meddling and "blundering." The Democratic journals applaud his statement as a splendid and courageous utterance. The comments of the *Springfield Republican* (Ind. Dem.)

may be taken as an example of Democratic opinion. This paper says:

If imperialism does not capture the Peace Conference and put the peace settlements into imperialistic chains, Woodrow Wilson will have been the single force causing its defeat. Imperialists know their enemy; they can recognize him in all languages. The fight at Paris against all the massed elements of rapacious imperialism has been forced upon the President of the United States from the beginning. No one else could have undertaken such a struggle with the slightest hope of even partial success. Mr. Wilson's triumph will by no means be complete, yet the degree of the fury and the hatred he arouses in imperialistic circles will be the measure of his actual achievement. Can Mr. Wilson afford to yield to imperialism much more ground? Not if the world is to obtain anything but a mockery of a "just and lasting peace."

In most of the Democratic papers stress is laid upon the "secret treaty factor" and the President is praised for grappling with an Old World abuse. The Presidential statement is regarded by these journals as conclusive against Italy which is described as grasping and rapacious. The *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* (Rep.) severely arraigns the policy of the President in the following words:

As far as the rest of the world is concerned and the general cause of international good-will, it makes little difference now what the decision of the Peace Conference on the Adriatic question is. At the most, the Conference can issue but a decree, to be enforced or not, as there is power or disposition to enforce it. What the Conference cannot do is to satisfy the expectations it aroused in the breasts of two antagonistic peoples. And while the fault may lie with the Conference as a whole, it was President Wilson, in his swing around the European circle, who is chiefly to blame. The Adriatic question is not one that can ever be settled to the satisfaction of all interested parties. Every crossroads student of international affairs knew this long before the United States entered the war, and if Mr. Wilson had approached the solution of this question with an appreciation of its insolubility his decision today would be accepted at its worth.

Mr. Wilson has sown dragons' teeth on both shores of the Adriatic. How long it will take for the crop to mature no man can say. Once Europe had the Balkan question as an ever-present nightmare. That still remains, and to it has been added the Adriatic question to trouble its dreams of peace.

Other Republican papers like the *New York Tribune* and the *Washington Post* lay more stress on the threatened rupture of friendship with Italy.

The sensation of the week at the Conference took place on April 30, when recognition was given to the Japanese claims to Shantung province. These claims were agreed to by the Council of Three, Mr. Wil-

Japanese Claims son concurring, to the surprise of many observers and the intense disappointment of the Chinese. By the agreement entered into, the integrity of China's sovereignty is pledged by Japan. It is semi-officially stated that President Wilson evidently believes that the guarantees afforded by the League of Nations will sufficiently protect the integrity and independence of China. The Japanese in the concessions made to them gained recognition of the principle for which they contended in 1915, viz., police authority in China proper, with Japanese supervision. This was one of the clauses in Group V of the "Twenty-one Demands" which China refused to accept in 1915 and was withdrawn by Japan. Now Japan has gained recognition of the other three great Powers, Italy not being represented, of its right to police the Shantung railways with Chinese, officered by Japanese officials. It has made a "gentleman's agreement" to return Kiao-Chau to China within a reasonable time. Not only the British and French delegations advocated the acceptance of the Japanese claims, but Colonel House also agreed to them. It is reported that Secretary Lansing had another solution in view, but the Japanese delegates insisted that they would recognize no other alternative, and that if their demands were not granted they would retire from the Conference as the Italians did. Italians claim that the Council of Three showed inconsistency in refusing Fiume to Italy and giving Kiao-Chau to Japan. They intend, apparently, to use the Kiao-Chau settlement as an argument in favor of their Fiume claims.

The Allied Commissioners showed dissatisfaction with the credentials of the German plenipotentiaries offered to them. On investigation they found it uncertain whether the German envoys had authority to act for Bavaria and another meeting was called to settle the question. The Allied representatives, while regretting the delay, do not at present find it a great hindrance to progress for the final draft of the treaty was not ready, on the arrival of the Germans.

Among the terms of the treaty to which the Germans will offer the most objection is that relating to the surrender of the German colonies. They will demand that German East Africa, Togoland and Kamerun be left to them. If this be refused, they will urge that they may retain some share in their future administration, and that in any case Germany shall not be debarred from purchasing some of the Portuguese colonies, should Portugal be willing to sell. They will also ask that the Saar region be returned to Germany after a term of years. They will strenuously oppose any scheme to deprive them of sovereignty over the Kiel Canal, but are willing that it be open

and free to the commerce of the world. They will also oppose any "Polish corridor," but will guarantee to Poland the right of transit both by rail and by the Vistula to Dantzig, and while opposing any plan to deprive them of sovereignty over the city, will agree that portions of Dantzig be reserved exclusively for Polish commerce. It was reported officially on May 4 that the Belgian Government unanimously decided that the awards to Belgium by the Peace Conference are entirely unsatisfactory and unacceptable, and so instructed the Belgian delegation at Paris.

Brazil.—On April 24, his Excellency M. Magalhaes de Azevedo, who presented his credentials to the Holy See as Minister to the Vatican for Brazil in the month of

The New Ambassador

October, 1914, was again admitted to an audience with the Supreme Pontiff, this time as Ambassador of his country to the Holy See. In his address to the Pope, which was given in the throne room, he said that the elevation of the Brazilian legation to the rank of an embassy had been effected by the President with the approval of the national Congress, and that this act had for its purpose "to give a solemn manifestation of the high esteem in which the President and the Parliament of Brazil held the excellent relations which had obtained for almost a century between the Brazilian nation and the Holy See."

Brazil, he declared, recognized in the Catholic Faith one of the characteristics of its national spirit and one of the important factors of its greatness. He rendered homage to the apostolic action of the Pope, especially in his dealings with Brazil, and assured him that both the people and the Government of Brazil would enthusiastically support him in his efforts to consolidate a peace founded on the loyalty of governments and peoples. Benedict XV in his answer paid a graceful compliment to the people whom the Ambassador represents and to his Excellency himself, expressed his desire to see realized a just and lasting peace, and voiced the hope that in America, at least, the Christian Faith would save the nations from the misery which had swept over Europe.

Czecho-Slovakia.—A writer in the *New York Times Magazine* for April 13 quotes with approval the words of a New York Bohemian minister concerning his own

Catholic Population

countrymen to the effect that: "They are Roman Catholics by birth, infidel by necessity, and Protestant by history and inclination." It is true, as *Studies* remarks, that from the time of Huss until the end of the Thirty Years' War Bohemia suffered so much from religious conflicts that "a population of about 3,000,000 dwindled down to some 800,000." By 1905, however, the population had again increased to 6,458,389, out of which number 6,210,385 were Catholics, 165,192 non-Catholic Christians and 92,757 Jews. In Moravia,

which has in general shared the fate of its neighbor and whose population is mainly constituted of Czechs or Slovaks, Catholics numbered 2,325,574, Protestants 66,365 and Jews 44,253. How absolutely false is the assertion quoted in the *Times* that Bohemia is Protestant by inclination will be evident from the fact that this enormous preponderance of Catholics exists in spite of the persistent Protestantizing efforts on the part of Prussia's *Los von Rom* movement, which was extended into Bohemia, and might have found a ready response there in view of the anti-Austrian sympathies, had there been any inclination towards Protestantism. During the very time that the Czech language was cultivated with the most enthusiastic devotion and at the greatest sacrifices, the Catholic religion flourished to the utmost and patriotic Catholic priests were held in suspicion and openly accused because of their strong nationalist sympathies. Referring to this Czech renaissance (of which the *Times* apparently knows nothing) *Studies* says:

Entirely Czech schools rose all over the land, Czech papers multiplied, Czech banks were founded and Czech factories sprang up to compete with German ones. . . . From 1890 to 1900 the total number of their elementary schools rose from 2,857 to 3,053, the Gymnasias from fourteen to thirty-four, averaging 243 pupils, technical schools from eight to twenty-three, averaging 378 on the rolls. As a result Bohemia boasts of the lowest average of illiteracy in the world.

To speak of the Protestant "martyrs" and forget the Hussite "orgies of fanatical cruelty" or the later "defenestration" of Catholic leaders is as unhistorical as to overlook the linguistic revival of recent times. From a nationalist point of view Bohemia, in her German population, presents an Ulster question far more serious than that which the British press exaggerates tenfold in the case of Ireland. "What will the Peace conference do for them?" asks *Studies*, "How will it solve this 'Ulster' problem which has a great deal more pith and substance in it than the one we know?"

France.—Mgr. Alfred Baudrillart, who was formally received into the French Academy on April 11, and who is remembered in the United States as a member of the

Reconciliation with the Vatican Commission which some months ago paid an official visit to our country, found it advisable, on April 15, in view of the discussion in French circles as to the possibility of the Vatican's being induced to accept the law of Separation between Church and State, voted on December 9, 1905, to restate the reasons which led him early in the year 1906 to declare that the law would not be accepted by the Holy See. On that occasion he declared to M. Rouvier that his opinion was based on two grounds: Article 8 of the law annulled recognition of the Catholic Hierarchy and made the Council of State the sovereign arbiter of any disputes which might arise; Rome could not approve ecclesiastical legislation emanating exclusively from the civil power and depending on it exclusively for its interpretation. Rome had had, he said,

no part whatever in the law, and the method of French legislation made it possible for the State at any moment to reduce the Church to a condition of complete subjection. The reconciliation of the Vatican with France, he continued, is, at present as formerly, by no means an insoluble question. Catholics demanded only two things: an understanding with the Holy See, and a law on *Associations Cultuelles* which should take formally into account the Catholic Hierarchy.

Ireland.—Recently a report was circulated here and abroad that the Irish delegates to Paris were willing to accept Home Rule for Ireland. This statement called forth the following official denial from Dr. McCarton, envoy of the Irish Republic, to the United States:

As persistent efforts are being made by unfriendly agencies to spread the impression abroad that the Irish delegates at Paris are willing to conclude an Anglo-Irish settlement on the basis of Home Rule for Ireland, it has become necessary for me, as the accredited representative of the Republic of Ireland to the United States, to state that there is not a shadow of foundation for the statements cabled from Paris tending to show that the Irish delegates there are willing to effect a compromise with Great Britain.

Some days ago we were informed that the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Lloyd George, had sent emissaries to Dublin to negotiate with Professor de Valera, President of Ireland, the intimation being that Great Britain and Ireland were about to settle the question of their future relationship outside the Peace Conference, Ireland to receive Dominion Home Rule or something of that kind. To confirm this point of view, an interview alleged to have been given by Mr. George Gavan Duffy, one of the Irish delegates at Paris, was published in certain papers in this country, in which Mr. Duffy was alleged to have expressly stated that seventy-five per cent of the people of Ireland favored Home Rule.

In order to give Mr. Duffy an opportunity of contradicting this malicious fabrication at its source, I communicated with him by cable, and have received the following reply:

"Home Rule is dead and buried; Irish delegates all claim international recognition of the established Republic, involving complete foreign evacuation of the whole island. On January 21, the Dail (Irish Parliamentary) unanimously ratified Easter Week proclamation on overwhelming mandate from the electors, pledging allegiance to the Republic and repudiating compromise."

This is proof positive, if indeed such be necessary, that the representatives of Ireland at Paris have no intention of discussing Home Rule or anything of that sort. In their demand for international recognition of the Republic of Ireland, and of the withdrawal of the British army of occupation, they have the active support and co-operation of the Irish-American envoys, Messrs. Walsh, Dunne and Ryan.

In other words, the attitude of Ireland is as it was at the last elections, freedom from England.

Mexico.—The Carranza government has repudiated the Monroe Doctrine as a "logical consequence" of the First Chief's policy which is "based upon the eternal principles of justice." In a long editorial *The Monroe Doctrine and German Property* of Carranza, declares the Doctrine an anachronism fit enough to further the selfish interests of

the United States, perhaps, but useless for the protection of Latin America. At any rate, Carranza desires to have no part with it, if, for no other reason, because Mexico never asked the help or protection of the United States, and the Doctrine, moreover, according to Mr. Wilson, has been a "perennial source of difficulty in conserving friendly relations" with the Latin-American republics. The editorial of *El Pueblo* reads in part:

If we examine carefully the text of the Monroe Doctrine, and analyze the spirit in which it was created, it is apparent that it was not evolved simply through a desire to protect weak nations against the menace of the Holy Alliance [the formation of which gave rise to the Doctrine], but rather to guard the United States itself against possible dangers. . . . Moreover, an exalted ideal of justice inspired the words the illustrious President Wilson delivered to Mexican journalists during their recent visit to the United States when, referring to the Monroe Doctrine, he declared that he considered it as a perennial source of difficulty in conserving friendly relations between that powerful country and the Latin-American republics. Here are his own words: "The famous Monroe Doctrine was adopted without your consent and without the consent of any Central American or South American State. We said: 'We are going to be your big brother, whether you want us to be or not.' . . . That was all very well as far as protecting you from aggression from the other side of the water, but there was nothing in it that protected you from aggression from us. . . . So I have said: 'Let us have a common guarantee that all of us will sign a declaration of political independence and territorial integrity.'"

The real reason of Carranza's pique is said to be the refusal of the Peace Conference to invite Mexico to join the League of Nations. This, too, is probably the reason why Mexico refused to recognize the financial clause of the armistice by which Germany agreed not to dispose of any of her stocks in specie or any of her foreign title deeds or bonds, whether in the country or abroad, whether in the possession of the Government, savings banks, private persons or companies, without previous agreement with the Allies.

A solemn conference of the various Protestant foreign mission boards operating from the United States was recently held at Mexico City. A plan was drawn up and accepted according to which all the "evangelical churches" united on a program which so apportions the entire country of Mexico that the work of one denomination will not overlap that of any other. The territory assigned to each sect is mapped out in the most minute detail. Thus the Congregationalists will occupy: "All of Sonora south of a line running east and west through Santa Ana; all of Sinaloa, Nayarit and Colima; and all of Jalisco except the Colotlan district as far south as Bolaños and the section east of the railway uniting Aguascalientes and Leon." With similar exactness the details are published concerning the various districts assigned respectively to the Methodist Episcopal Church South, the Friends, the Associate Reformed Presbyterians, the Disciples of Christ, the Presbyterian Church North, the

Presbyterian Church South, and the Methodist Episcopal Church. The capital city and the Federal district will be common territory where all the churches can work together. The method of "evangelization" within the specially assigned areas is thus described:

This means, for instance, that the Baptist, who insist on immersion as a requisite for membership in their Church, are to go into Methodist territory, perhaps, or where immersion has not been practised. They simply waive the immersion requirement and go ahead with the work.

Obviously a very simple procedure. In Mexico City itself a \$5,000,000 university is to be established, founded and endowed with money from the United States, a plan to which Carranza is said to have given his hearty assent. "In fact, he endorsed the whole program." The university is to be Christian but not sectarian, which we presume means that it will be inter-denominational. A board of directors in New York City will handle its affairs, but a majority of the teaching faculty is always to be of the Latin race. Further details of the program are thus given by the *Boston Evening Transcript*:

This includes a hospital also in the City of Mexico, eight agricultural schools in as many different sections of the Republic, a community center or institutional church and a school of mechanical arts in each city of importance in Mexico, normal schools in such districts as do not already possess them and the strengthening of those already existing under the system for which Mexico owes so much to Osuna, the development of the Union Theological Seminary which is already in existence in Mexico City, and an intensive campaign over the whole of Mexico to popularize medical knowledge.

In addition to the \$5,000,000 which it is proposed to spend on the new university, the hospital to be established in Mexico City will call for \$1,600,000, and \$600,000 is to be spent on Union Theological Seminary. Two industrial schools will take \$500,000 more.

Portugal.—Quite recently the Holy Father granted an audience to the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Portugal to the Holy See, his Excellency,

The Minister to the Vatican S. Manoel Forge Forbes de Bena. He was received in the throne room with all the solemn ceremonies usual

on such occasions. The incident has an important significance because it marks the formal resumption of diplomatic relations between Portugal and the Holy See. It will be remembered that these relations were broken at the very beginning of the Portuguese Republic. The Republic, in its first stage, was an active persecutor of the Church. S. Sidonio Paes, when he assumed the reins of government, mitigated the severity of the anti-clerical legislation and endeavored to re-establish relations with the Vatican. He appointed S. José Feliciano da Costa, Minister to the Holy See, but the latter, owing to insuperable difficulties, was not able to present his credentials. His successor, the present Minister, who was formerly President of the Senate, had to overcome many obstacles before he arrived at Rome; but his presentation at the Vatican is now an accomplished fact.

Caillaux and Jaurès

J. C. WALSH

Staff Correspondent of "America"

ON Sunday, April 6, the Socialists and Syndicalists of Paris turned out to mark their disapproval of the acquittal of the assassin of Jean Jaurès. It was not a very large procession, in point of numbers, especially when estimated in terms of percentage of the total population, but it was nevertheless an interesting demonstration. Those who marched looked to be of the fairly comfortable artisan class, grading upward and downward, however, in evidence of worldly comfort. There was a sprinkling of men in uniform, mainly very young men. There were evidently a good many more who had worn the uniform very recently. In the main it was a man's procession, but in every group there were women, and they were there not as feminists and apart, but with their husbands, brothers and others. In not a few instances the children accompanied their parents. It was a good-humored affair. The singing of the international hymn added somewhat to the air of enjoyment, although the air is something short of joyous. Some tens of thousands marched thus to a little square near the home of Jaurès' widow, cheered before a marble bust of the leader, and then vanished into the Bois. One with a special gift of imagination could reconstruct scenes of revolution for which Paris used to be famous, but the chances are that the ruling powers are well content with the satisfactory way in which the safety-valve functioned. There was not enough display of wrath to occasion discomfort to any of the numerous *gendarmes* who were gathered at important corners.

Parisians, no doubt, are prepared to contemplate such a spectacle without much introspection, but I have yet to meet the first trans-Atlantic observer who is not ready to confess himself mystified by the relation which seems to exist between political opinion and the administration of justice here. The man who shot Clemenceau was promptly condemned to death although his victim still goes about his work. The man who shot Jaurès was acquitted after a trial in which, I think it is fair to say, his presence was regarded as an unwelcome intrusion. All Jaurès' political associates appeared at the trial and delivered orations in his praise, some of them hours in length. After two or three days of this the prisoner ventured an observation, more or less irrelevant, and everybody present was frankly startled by this reminder that there was a person present in a more serious quality than that of spectator. Only his rights as a prisoner on trial stood in the way of his being ordered out of the place. Jaurès having been tried and, on the testimony of his friends, acquitted of unpatriotic intention, the man who shot him was quietly relieved of blame. The procession was a protest against that.

Now, no doubt, the case is ended. In general, the feeling seems to be that, whatever his merits, Jaurès guessed wrong about the war, and therefore his taking off is to be overlooked, whereas, Clemenceau's war-record having been different, the attempt to assassinate him calls for drastic treatment. It all looks odd to those of us who have conceptions of the process of justice based on traditions which are different. Still, the French are a most tenaciously logical people, and there must be some reasonableness in what they are doing, if one could only get at the basis of it.

I thought I got a hint of it the other day in a conversation with a gentleman who has just made a translation, principally for the benefit of Americans, of a book of Jacques Bainville which involves a comparison of France and Germany, or rather of French and Germans, since the time of Charlemagne, say a thousand years. The moral of it is that the attitude of the one towards the other has been practically the same during all that period, from which it is to be deduced that the attitude of the one towards the other will remain pretty much the same for some time still. Bainville is probably the most authoritative writer on foreign relations in the Paris press of today. He writes mainly for *L'Action Française*, which is Royalist, but his articles appear in two or three Republican papers also and in one which is mildly Bonapartist. His text is that France is being cheated in the peace, and he bases his argument, which is thus seen to be accepted in circles widely separated in regard to internal politics, upon the fundamental conception that since it is the existence of Germany which constitutes a threat to the existence of France, what France requires is a state of things in which Germany will be incapable of doing France an injury. Naturally, he does not stop there. He holds the Allies to what they have said about France being the first line of defense of all the countries to the westward, and protests against France being left to hold the line unaided, with the resulting ghastly sacrifice of her manhood and her material resources, until the others, at their own convenience, have pulled themselves together. He thinks the Allies ought to make up for France's sacrifices in their interest at least and prevent by present decisions the recurrence of such an onslaught, and, if there must be an onslaught, then they ought to be on hand in the first line of defense themselves and not leave it all to France and perhaps Belgium. Proceeding from these assumptions, it is easy to see how Bainville and those who agree with him as to the essentials are out of patience with the Peace Conference, and especially with the developments which indicate to them

at least, that England and the United States, swayed by different considerations, are preparing for a new start in Europe, the enduring consequence of which will be to leave France a stricken victim of the conflict now ended and helpless to make head against the next assault, if there is to be one.

All this rests upon the assumption that as between France and Germany the normal state is one of war, actual and potential. It assumes, indeed, that France is always in the right, but that is something every country invariably assumes. At least I know of no exception. Where there is a colorable doubt all governments fall back upon the dictum, "*Civis Romanus sum*." Here, it seems, comes in the consideration which has to do with Jaurès, with the spectacle presented by the trial of Humbert and Lenoir, and with the case of Caillaux, ready for its turn in the mixed courts of justice and shifty public opinion.

Caillaux, his enemies concede, those of them at least who are willing to go to the root of things, was one of those who thought, in the years before the war, that there was greater safety for France in a friendly understanding with Germany. It is urged against him, even by those who concede that this was the underlying motive of his policy, that his position was necessarily unsound because there could be no understanding with Germany which did not involve, whether immediately or as result of a slow process, the humiliation of France, the surrender of her ideals, the exterior exploitation of her resources, the humiliation of her people, and the definitive loss of what used to be conceded as her "legitimate preponderance in Europe." Always, moreover, there was the unappeasable anger over Alsace and Lorraine, which only increased as it was seen that under the application of German science and organization the economic importance of the lost provinces steadily, yet amazingly increased. Caillaux's conception of the preferable relations between France and Germany was undoubtedly influenced by the fact that German organization had already secured an influence over French finance, manipulating the instrumentalities of French Government to its will. For years rival financial groups had been behind the movements by which governments were made and unmade. In fact the industrial and commercial aggressiveness of Germany uncovered what must be regarded as one of France's weaknesses. The French are a saving people, and necessarily they entrust their savings to the banks; but the banks paid them only one per cent, or even half of one per cent, on their deposits. The continuance of such a condition meant, and only could mean, that there was not in France such a competition for the productive employment of these savings as there is in America, as there is in England, and, as it appeared, as there was in Germany. When a Canadian bank with a branch in Paris offered three per cent, it was looked upon with suspicion, which only a long and honorable record sufficed

to dissipate. Of course the money was employed in Canada. Naturally the Germans, having acquired the habit of making money earn money in the industry and commerce they were so rapidly building up, were keen to get the use of the cheap money lying at their door. Through the medium of Swiss financial institutions, to whose direction they were not strangers, they largely succeeded, and they further assured the success of the operation by perfecting international alliances which gave them a friendly footing in financial circles in Paris itself. Here, undoubtedly, was one of the main springs of the Caillaux political organization. But here, also, both Caillaux and Germany encountered powerful adverse forces. While French savings were not employed to a high percentage of efficiency in the promotion of French industry and commerce, the manipulation of these savings was the foundation of many great fortunes. It has been, and is still, common to find in French writings, and on the French stage, allusions to "one of the handsomest fortunes in France, except of course in finance," finance being regarded as something mysterious, outside the common life.

Indeed, the French conception of day-to-day existence is, in large measure, a direct challenge to the German, the English, the American conception. No American has ever become reconciled to the French rule of closing the shops, even on the busiest thoroughfares, between twelve and two. Certainly no German ever did such a thing. But neither have German nor English nor American, taking the mass, been able to sense, much less to approve, the remarkable development of cultural activity, the intensity of intellectual preoccupations, the elevation of literary and artistic perceptions, the refinements of social intercourse and ordered existence, the passionate devotion to one or another phase of spiritual ideals, which the French would not think of exchanging for the rewards of incessant work with which the rest of us are willing to be satisfied. One hears nowadays a general lament that in the circumstances in which France emerges from the war it may be necessary for her to turn away from all these things which have made life worth living and sink into the mere humdrum of industrialism which has produced in other countries the drab humdrum of existence which every Frenchman in his heart despises. There may be a France in which the people have forgotten how to smile. Instinctively, that was what France feared from German penetration, that was what made France hostile to the Caillaux policy even before the war. The accusation, easily credited in such a state of feeling, is that during the war Caillaux not merely persisted in his views but depended for their furtherance upon methods involving actual treason to the French State as well as constructive treason to the French ideal. His trial will be held with France in that state of mind and with the courts subordinated to public opinion.

Jaurès seems to have approached consideration of the same vital question, to wit, whether international antag-

onism was essential and permanent, from a different angle. He seems to have realized, better than most, that the war, the war with Germany, if it came, would be a long-drawn-out conflict in which millions would be engaged and in which millions would perish. He sensed the weight of such a blow to France even if France were victorious. He dreaded the consequences to humanity, to French humanity, of an up-flaring of the rivalry of States. Unlike Caillaux, he could foresee no beneficial outcome of the interlocking of financial responsibilities in mutual participation, in commercial adventures. He argued that humanity must protect itself; and the agency he found ready to his hand and which in France he developed with all the power of a personality, which carried millions with him, was international Socialism. His answer to war was to call a general strike in the countries called by their governments to participate in that war. He dreaded the Russian alliance, because he feared that Russia would not be amenable to such a remedy. He burst into tears when he heard that Russia was mobilizing. He underestimated the dynamic forces liberated, when masses of men are swept into conflict under the inspiration of impulses as old as the race of man. He was the first victim of the war he strove to avoid. The fact that 1,500,000 of his countrymen, more than even he anticipated, perished with him, that 1,500,000 more have been maimed and mutilated, that France, even in victory, has been harder hit even than he foresaw, goes

for nothing. He erred, he failed at the critical hour, and it is against his reputation as a statesman that the verdict has been rendered. Men and women marching in protest against the verdict, singing as they go, cheering in honor of his shadow, will not change that verdict.

Now all is to begin over again. France is France, as much alone, according to the general belief in Paris, as when, in 1870, the only help to come from all the world outside was an ambulance corps from Ireland which quickly transformed itself into a fighting unit. Even those who would like to cheer for Mr. Wilson are not so sure they can risk it. Banks, business and Bolsheviki seem to be forming combinations against which French logic is directed in vain. Those who were allies before November 11 are now frankly rivals. Those who then accepted France's formulas now confine themselves to other subjects of conversation. France is reluctantly coming to the view that it is possible to be victor in a war and still be its principal victim. And the French are human enough to believe that the blame for this lies elsewhere, that it falls upon their whilom friends as well as upon their permanent enemies. Nowhere yet in any Paris paper have I noticed any attempt made to envisage present problems from any viewpoint other than that of France. When they look to America they see only Mr. Morgan's bank. Unless there is a great and unexpected change, and that very soon, I am afraid that in France Lafayette has had his day.

Justice for the Pope

JOHN C. REVILLE, S. J.

ITALY demands that the Treaty of London, the pact signed by her and the Entente Allies, France, England and Russia, on April 26, 1915, be now carried out to the letter. A reading of the various articles of that document, is not calculated to win the admiration of any true lover of democracy or fair-play. In the fourth article it is stipulated that in return for and in recognition of her services to the Allied cause, Italy was to get the Trentino, Southern Tyrol, Trieste, Gorizia, Gradisca, and the Istrian peninsula. By the fifth and following articles she was to get Dalmatia and the Dalmatian Islands; the most important sections of Albania; the Dodecanesos Islands in the Mediterranean. By the twelfth she agreed to the formation of a Mohammedan power independent of the Turks. In virtue of the thirteenth article she was to receive more territory in Africa in compensation for anything England or France might obtain. In accordance with the fifteenth article, France, England and Russia agreed to join Italy in a combined effort to bar the Pope from having anything to do with making peace. Finally the treaty was to be kept secret.

With regard to the demands and the bargains made for territorial enlargement little need be said. Strange as some of them appear, they belong to the realm of politics pure and simple. Concerning the formation of a Mohammedan power independent of the Turks, it is hard to understand how any country calling itself Christian could in any way further the continuance of a civilization which is essentially foreign to the ideals and traditions of western Europe. But the demand made that the three great Powers then at war with Germany and Austria-Hungary should combine with Italy in barring the Pope from the future Peace Conference and prevent him from becoming in any way a factor in making peace, was as unstatesmanlike as it was unjust.

Perhaps even now Italian statesmen in the secret of their heart are regretting the hour when they so curtly refused entrance to the Conference to the only power which is above the jealousies, trickeries and ambitions of worldly policies and which though neither Italian nor French nor English, sympathizes with all nations and would impartially and fearlessly speak up for their just and honorable claims. If Italy, mindful of the injustice

which her rulers had done to the Popes by depriving them, in the person of Pius IX, of their age-long dominion over the Papal States and Rome, feared that the Roman question would be opened at the Conference and that the Pope would take occasion of the general shifting of old landmarks and boundaries in Europe to put in a formal claim for the restoration of the temporal power, the fears were groundless. No doubt the Pope would welcome the restoration of the temporal power. He knows that such a power is necessary not for the existence but for the well-being, the freedom of the Church. The Papal States belong not to him alone, but to the Church of Christ. But if the Pope during the war reasserted his demand, as he was in conscience bound to do, for the "rectification" and the "readjustment" of his unnatural and at times intolerable position in Rome, where he is made to feel too keenly that he, the lawful and rightful prince, is an intruder, he has never done anything or inspired any policy that could possibly be distorted into the belief that he was aiming at the disruption of Italy.

In November, 1914, a month after his elevation to the Pontifical throne, Benedict XV, let it be clearly known to the world that "all who profess themselves sons of the Roman Pontiff rightly demand a guarantee" that the "common Father of all" should be seen to be free from all human power in the administration of his Apostolic office. He is not afraid then to protest against the abnormal position in which he is placed. But, if the Pontiff was anxious to let the world know that he did not tamely submit to a state of apparent vassalage with regard to the Italian Government, it was made plain by his own acts and by the authoritative statements of his Secretary of State, Cardinal Gasparri, that the Holy See did not intend to create embarrassment for the Italian Government. To that policy the Pope adhered all during the war. He would certainly have followed that same policy had he been allowed to be represented at the Peace Conference. But the Pope was ignominiously thrust aside. The successor of the Leos, the Gregories, the Innocents and the Alexanders, who saved Roman civilization from the hordes of Attila and his Huns, tamed the lawlessness and rebuked the cruelty of the German Emperors of the eleventh century, curbed the passions of wicked kings, and were among the first to pronounce the doctrine that all men are by nature equal, was not to have a place in the councils of a world distraught, and that knows not where to turn to find a remedy for the evils of the day or what ramparts and dikes to build to stem the mounting waves of social ruin and anarchy.

As we look now upon the work of the Peace Conference we see that the Pope was sadly needed there. He would not have been out of place in its sessions. For in the great world congresses, ever since the days of those first international conventions known as the Councils of the Church, his voice has been heard in almost every

gathering, where the fate of empires and peoples was settled. It would be too much to ask of the predecessors of Benedict XV, that in the countless disputes concerning temporal affairs with which they were in their capacity of civil rulers called upon to deal, they never were mistaken. But it can be asserted without fear of contradiction that with the rarest exceptions they were on the side of justice and right, that at times theirs was the only voice lifted up for the people.

Benedict would have followed the noble precedent given him by the great Pontiffs of the past. At present when shorn of temporal power, he has no interest at stake but the welfare of all. He has children in Ireland, in Germany, in Poland, in the United States, in England, in disputed Fiume, in France and Alsace-Lorraine. He is an Italian by birth and blood, by racial and family traditions. He would do his beloved Italy justice, but not to the wrong or the prejudice of others. The Vatican is the international clearing house for the policies of the world. The Pope because of his position of spiritual head of almost 300,000,000 faithful subjects scattered throughout every continent, every isle of the sea, is better acquainted, through cardinal, legate, bishop and commission, with the trend of the world's affairs, the needs and the just aspirations of peoples, than any cabinet or ministry or combination of statesmen. By his position and experience he is an expert in international problems. Unswayed by prejudice, he is above the pettiness of party or the dictates of a narrow nationalism. The Papacy is old and trained in the knowledge of the world. If in dealing with human affairs, it does not wield the golden keys of Peter, for its authority in such a sphere is not of Divine but of human origin, it still has the key of those ever-recurring world-problems with which it has been dealing for centuries. The statesmanship and the policies of the oldest and the most experienced cabinets in the world are young indeed and but of yesterday when compared with those of the ever-renewed line of the White Shepherds of the Seven Hills.

Why was the Pope then excluded from the Conference? One, no doubt, of the fundamental reasons for such a conduct, and when all is considered, the fundamental reason perhaps is that unnatural and dangerous theory of the separation, the complete divorce of religion from the realm of politics and international law. According to the upholders of such a theory statesmanship and religion should be placed in separate and tightly sealed bulkheads, they have nothing to do with one another, different laws preside over their respective departments. Statecraft for them has its own morality, it need not submit itself to the principles of religion when it finds these in contradiction with its own interests or demands. It relegates religion to the private life and activities of the individual, it will not admit its influence or its restraint in the open forum of the policies of the world. This is a species of practical State atheism, which if it does not openly deny the Creator, at least ignores Him.

Even those who heartily believe in the principle of a League of Nations and who long to see justice done to all no matter who they may be, must have felt their enthusiasm and ardor chilled when the men who are engaged in the reconstruction of the world, and in solving the most momentous problems a Peace Conference was ever called upon to face, never in a single instance officially referred to the Deity, never asked His blessing on their labors, never reminded the peoples for whom they are laboring when speaking to them of justice and right, that God is the source of all justice and all law and that unless His rights are respected, it is greatly to be feared that the rights of individuals and nations, even if safeguarded by covenants and treaties, will be ignored and violated. No one expects that the members of the Peace Conference should imitate the offensive pose and pietism of the framers and principals of the Holy Alliance of a hundred years ago, who in reality degraded religion by binding it as a slave to the car of politics, but serious-minded citizens of four great countries still calling themselves Christian cannot but feel disheartened, when they see religion and God kept away from the very place where His guidance is most needed and His help absolutely necessary. For "unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it."

With the Pope at the Conference, the atmosphere of religion would have penetrated into the assembly. For it is impossible, even though his spiritual prerogatives might not have been recognized, that the Pope should not bring with him, his legates and representatives some aura, or influence, that would point to some thing higher than material interests and political victories. With him some invisible and subtle power could have filtered into the councils of statesmen. Some emanation from a higher law would have flitted over their deliberations. The world would have been the gainer.

Italy was not wise in barring out the Supreme Pontiff from the Conference. The other signers of the Pact of London were as guilty. For the Pope would have been Italy's best adviser, best friend. The Roman Tacitus says, that the criminal usually hates the victim of his injustice. He not only hates him, he fears him. For his presence constantly reminds him of his own wrongdoing. His victim is a living indictment of his crime. The representatives of the Italian Government, heirs of the unscrupulous statesmen who unjustly seized Rome, would have been ill at ease before the victim of that cruel spoliation. They would have been in constant dread of an appeal from that victim. As we said, that fear would have been groundless. For the moment, Benedict XV, great as are his wrongs, and intolerable as his position at Rome is, would have generously let his grievances slumber. None more wisely, more justly, and unselfishly than he, would have labored for the prosperity and the happiness of the world. None better than he could have outlined and laid down the secure foundations of a strong and permanent temple of peace.

A Catholic College for the People

J. ELLIOT ROSS, C.S.P.

WITH tremendous sacrifices, the Catholic people of this country have finally built up an excellent school system. From the kindergarten to the university we have examples of truly Catholic institutions competing successfully with the heavily endowed State and private schools. Looking back on the general results of fifty years we may well be proud of the record of achievement.

But our well-founded self-congratulation need not blind us to the one serious gap in the whole chain. In one sense the Catholic system extends from the kindergarten to the university, but in another and perhaps more important sense it does not. We have these institutions in existence, but the higher we go in the scale the fewer Catholics they are reaching. About twenty-five per cent of our children attend Catholic elementary schools, less than two per cent go to our high schools, and only a fraction of one per cent ever get to our colleges.

Therefore while theoretically we have a complete system of education stretching from infancy to maturity, as a matter of fact this system reaches rather less than thirty per cent of our people. The other seventy per cent are to a large extent beyond its influence. For one reason or another most of our children do not go on beyond the grammar grades, and very few of those who pass on to high school ever get to college. Consequently our system of Catholic schools, built up at such great sacrifice, is running only thirty per cent efficient at best, because it is reaching only that proportion of the Catholics of this country.

Those who never go to Catholic schools, or those who having gone drop out at some point along the way, are left to the educational efforts of our press and pulpits. From the nature of the case, however, neither of these agencies can teach as well as a school. Powerful as are both these influences, they have not that connectedness and thoroughness which is possible in academic institutions. And their appeal being general, the effect is likely to be too diffused for any really personal and individual teaching.

Are we, then, to leave this vast number of Catholics whom our schools at present do not reach, to the chances of reading a Catholic paper or to the disconnected influences of a weekly sermon? Are we to rest contented with the reflection that of necessity a school system cannot possibly reach the whole population?

It is true, indeed, that no school system, no matter how perfect or richly endowed, can ever reach the whole population of a country or a church. Nevertheless, a method of reaching a greater number than we do reach, of getting close to at least a goodly fraction of the most eager to learn of that large group unable to attend college, has been devised and successfully put in practice.

And if secular educators, either to make money or to extend the influence of a godless institution, can do this, why cannot we with the much higher and greater motive of love for souls do the same?

The idea of taking education to the people instead of bringing the people to an institution originated as a commercial enterprise. The international correspondence schools with their somewhat boastful advertisement, "The World Our School," were at first ridiculed by the long-established, old-fashioned educational institutions. The academic world was not easily jolted out of a rut. But as these correspondence schools gradually demonstrated the possibility of teaching by mail, some of the recognized universities of the country began experimenting with this method. Today, the University of Wisconsin spends a quarter of a million a year on extension work of one kind or another in the effort to take the university to the people, and many other first-class institutions either have correspondence courses of their own or else recognize work done by correspondence.

So far, however, our Catholic institutions have been very slow to see the possibilities of this movement. The Catholic University several years ago tried some extension teaching by sending a few professors to lecture in New York, and a few correspondence courses in pedagogy have been offered. But no widespread effort has been made to take our colleges to our people.

This is the more remarkable when we consider that several features of this extension work would have a special application for our Catholics and would help to solve the problem of teaching religion to those who never go to our Catholic schools or who leave them early. Many a man, for instance, who has been compelled by circumstances to leave school, would be glad to take a correspondence course in ethics, in religion, in church history. He cannot retrace his steps and go to school in the old way, but if our colleges will go to him he will welcome their efforts. Even those who have gone to our colleges may later in life profit by these courses because they will bring to them maturer minds and a wider experience of life. The wholesome effects of responsibilities, of sorrow, and suffering will have made them appreciate religion to a greater extent than in the irresponsible college days.

And correspondence courses would help another group of persons, a group that we ought to try to reach on account of their probable future influence. I mean those Catholics who are going to the great non-sectarian universities of the country. No one will dispute the fact that the ideal is to get them into our own colleges. But no one, also, will dispute the fact that we shall never get them all there. Because of propinquity, financial exigencies, special courses, and so on, thousands of Catholics annually attend other than Catholic colleges. Are we to leave them there, or are we to make an effort to help them in every possible way?

If it were possible to force them into our own colleges,

it might reasonably be argued that nothing should be done that would in any way appear to sanction their attending non-Catholic universities. But as this is impossible, it would seem the part of wisdom to make their attendance as innocuous as possible. And one way is by allowing them to substitute a Catholic course of history and philosophy for those which they would otherwise have to take in the non-Catholic college. As most colleges now give credit for correspondence work when done at a recognized college, these students could take history and philosophy by correspondence from some good Catholic college and so be relieved of the danger of these courses under non-Catholic professors.

It is not a question of having them study these subjects by correspondence or in Catholic colleges, but of having them study them in this way or under non-Catholic auspices. Only an inappreciable number, probably, would be influenced to attend non-Catholic colleges on this account. The greater number by far would be going to such institutions whether these correspondence courses were offered or not.

Besides the correspondence courses for credit or otherwise, universities that have gone into extension work offer what are called group-study courses. A subject of quite general interest, such as Socialism, woman suffrage, Prohibition, and so on, is outlined in detail. Ordinarily, it is divided into eight or ten sections, each one intended to cover one meeting of the group. References are given to books bearing on the subject, and if the group wishes it, these books will be sent along. And where the distance allows, a professor is furnished to start off the work.

If our Catholic colleges would offer some such group-study courses, perhaps the meetings of our Catholic societies might be made more interesting and profitable. It is telling no secrets out of school to say that the meetings of many units of the Knights of Columbus, the Daughters of Isabella, and other organizations, are dull and barren. The officers burdened with the task of supplying lectures or entertainments find their duty almost impossible of fulfilment, especially in the smaller towns. It would be a blessing if they could turn to some such arrangement as a group-study course prepared by Catholic experts.

Again, some non-sectarian universities have what they call package libraries. A number of magazines and newspapers are clipped and the articles bearing on live topics are placed in appropriate envelopes. Debating clubs, societies, schools, and individuals write in to ask for information on particular questions, and these little packages of clippings are sent in return.

What an advantage this would be in forming Catholic opinion in our smaller towns and rural communities! How invaluable it would be sometimes in answering a critic to be able to confront him with an article clipped from some Catholic magazine! The possibilities of this package library in the way of spreading truth and answer-

ing difficulties are enormous. Nothing, perhaps, offers greater returns for such a small outlay, nothing will reach a larger number in a way appropriate to themselves.

Another feature of extension work is the furnishing of illustrated lectures. The slides and descriptive matter are prepared at the university and sent out on request. Subjects of special interest to Catholics might easily be selected. For instance, a timely lecture would be the Cathedrals of France. Another might be Catholic art of the Middle Ages. Innumerable topics will occur to anyone.

All these methods, with the possible exception of the package library, can be made almost entirely self-supporting. Perhaps it is better to make them so, on the principle that what people pay for they will appreciate. Individuals and groups are likely to study harder if they have paid out money for a course, than if it is given gratis.

But the funds necessary to start such courses, to advertise them, to bring them thoroughly before the public, could probably be furnished by some Catholic organization, such as the Knights of Columbus. What better work could they turn to now? It would be helping themselves at the same time that they helped the Catholic college and helped the great Catholic public. The Knights have financed a commission on religious prejudice, they have put out a cheap edition of the "Catholic Encyclo-

pedia," they have taken care of our welfare work during the war. What will be next? Let us fervently hope that it will be the inauguration of extension work at some great Catholic university which will bring it to thousands of students who otherwise would be completely beyond its influence.

The University of Texas is comparatively small, and its extension department is weak in comparison with those of some other universities. But through its various kinds of extension work it annually reaches scores of thousands. Several hundred courses are offered by correspondence, numerous group-study courses are given, illustrated lectures sent out, interscholastic leagues organized, and in many ways the university is taken to the people.

In some ways the field of a Catholic university, such as that at Washington or St. Louis, would be larger. It would not be restricted to any one State. Its scope would be as wide as the Union. With comparatively little outlay it could be made to reach scores of thousands who otherwise would be deprived of the benefits of a Catholic education. And while this is not the ideal method of teaching, while it would be better to have these scores of thousands in the university proper, it is a great deal better that they should study by correspondence than that they should not study at all. At present, unfortunately, they are not studying at all.

The Pallium and Its Significance

J. HARDING FISHER, S.J.

A GREAT deal of interest attaches just at present to the investiture with the pallium of the three recently appointed Archbishops of the United States, a ceremony which marks their entrance on the full possession of their metropolitan prerogatives. In view of the fact that the conferring of these ecclesiastical insignia, which are so highly distinctive of the higher hierarchical offices, has from time out of memory held so conspicuous a place in Church discipline, the function might naturally be presumed to be a familiar one to all Catholics, the more so as it is so clear a testimony to the continuity of Apostolic succession. Strange to say, however, it has an element of the unknown even for the well-informed laymen.

The pallium is an ecclesiastical vestment worn in virtue of their office by the Pope and Archbishops, as the outward sign that they either possess the plenitude of pontifical power, as is the case with the Holy Father, or have been admitted by the latter to a participation in it, as is the case with the Archbishops, for the exercise thereof within the sphere of their jurisdiction. When conceded to a bishop it is merely a distinction of honor.

The first use of the pallium is lost in the twilight of Christian antiquity. Archeological remains, mainly dip-

tychs, mosaics and frescoes, have thrown light on the subject, and this information has been supplemented by ecclesiastical writers, such as John the Deacon, of the ninth century, and Durandus, of the twelfth. True, Padre Garucci asserted to have found representations of it in glass vessels of the fourth century, but critics have not admitted his claims to be above dispute. Certain frescoes in the Catacombs, for instance, those of St. Cornelius, St. Xystus and St. Cyprian, have been deciphered as showing the pallium, and these belong to the sixth century. Father Thurston, whose authority in such matters can scarcely be overestimated, finds indubitable examples of the pallium in the ivory at Treves and in the mosaics of Ravenna and of St. Agnes outside Rome, and thus establishes the fact that by the seventh century the use of the pallium was prevalent.

Written evidence takes us still further back. The *Liber Pontificalis* states that Pope Marcus, whose death is assigned to the year 351, conceded the pallium to the Bishop of Ostia. According to this testimony the earliest date of its use would not be later than the first half of the fourth century. Isidore of Pelusium mentions the pallium as one of the episcopal insignia in the early part of the fifth century. The First Council of Macon, which was held

in the year 581, laid down the law that no archbishop should presume to celebrate Mass without it. St. Gregory had a lengthy correspondence with the Archbishops of Ravenna before the close of the sixth century concerning some alleged abuses which had crept into that diocese in the use of the pallium, and there is clear and detailed testimony concerning the concession of the pallium to St. Augustine, the apostle to Britain, in the year 601. Those who have given exhaustive consideration to the question, such as the learned Abbé Duchesne, are convinced that the earliest use of the pallium, if it cannot be established with certainty, goes back to the beginning of the fifth century.

The pallium passed through a series of changes until by the beginning of the tenth century it had become fixed in what is practically its present form. It is worn outside the chasuble of the archbishop, while he is celebrating solemn High Mass on certain great festivals known as the feasts of the pallium, such as Christmas, while he is officiating at ordinations, and on other less common occasions; it may not be used, however, outside of the archbishop's own diocese or province. It consists of a white woolen band about two inches wide passing around the neck in a circular form and holding two pendants, twelve inches in length, of the same material and width, one in front and the other at the back, the ends of which are weighted and covered with black silk. It is ornamented with six small black crosses, one in the center of each pendant, and four on the collar, one over each shoulder and one above each pendant.

The pallium is made in Rome, and in its preparation are observed interesting and symbolic ceremonies which are thus described by Father Thurston:

Every year on the feast of St. Agnes while the choir are singing the antiphon "*Stans a dextris eius agnus nive candidior*," in her church in the Via Nomentana, outside Rome, two white lambs are offered at the sanctuary-rails by the community of Lateran Canons Regular. The lambs are placed upon the altar, blessed, and presented to two canons of St. John Lateran, who take them afterwards in a carriage to the Pope to receive his blessing. They are then given into the care of some religious until the proper time for shearing them, when their wool is taken, mixed with other lambswool, and woven into the pallia by the nuns of the convent of Torre de' Specchi. Early on the vigil of SS. Peter and Paul the new pallia are laid upon the altar in the Confession of St. Peter's, the crypt in which reposes the body of the Apostle. By a Constitution of Benedict XIV, issued in 1748, they are blessed, if possible by the Pope himself, after the Vespers sung on the vigil. When the consecration is completed these are not now, as formerly, taken to the sacristy until wanted, but they are left in a silver-gilt coffer in the closest proximity to the tomb of the Apostles, that the words in the form of conferring the pallium may be verified as literally as possible, "*Tradimus tibi pallium de corpore beati Petri sumptum*": "We confer on thee the pallium taken from the body of the blessed Peter."

Being in a strict sense a personal possession it may not be transferred to another occupant of the same see, nor

should it survive the person on whom it was originally conferred; at his death it must be interred with him, or, in any case, should that be impossible, it should be buried or burnt. At the same time it has an inseparable relation to a particular see, and, therefore, should the possessor of it be moved to any other archdiocese, he is obliged to petition the Sovereign Pontiff for another pallium.

The significance of the pallium is twofold: it symbolizes union with Christ the invisible Head of the Church, and with His Vicar on earth, the reigning Pope. It is reminiscent of the name which the Saviour was wont to apply to Himself, as for instance, when He said: "I am the good Shepherd," and it typifies His care of the fold. His rescues of the sheep by carrying them on His shoulders, the sacrifice of His life for them. And this name and office he bestowed on St. Peter and the Apostles and their successors.

The lambswool of which the pallium is made, and the manner in which it is worn are redolent of holy memories; they suggest at once the qualities that should characterize the associates of the Divine Pastor, the mission in which they participate, their sublime function of perpetuating the one sacrifice of the Lamb of God, and their more intimate share in the prerogatives of the Christian apostolate.

The pallium also serves to differentiate the Archbishops of the true Church from those who are in schism. Conferred only on those who are united with the See of Peter, it is a visible sign of Apostolic succession. This is clear from the words with which it is blessed: "May it be for him [the recipient] a symbol of unity with the Apostolic See, a sign of perfect communion, a bond of charity, a pledge of divine inheritance." The archbishop's warrant for taking possession of his diocese is the fact that he is clothed with the outward token of authority, brought straight from the tomb of the Prince of the Apostles, and conferred by the visible Head of the Church, to signify that the power of an archbishop is held of the Roman Pontiff, and of him alone, and that it is a participation in the fulness of the pontifical office.

This dependence on the Pope is further emphasized by the oath of fealty to the Holy Father which the archbishop takes during the Mass of investiture. After the Communion of the celebrant the archbishop-elect kneels before the prelate deputed to confer the pallium, which meanwhile lies in the center of the altar, and clad in all the vestments used at Mass, solemnly, with his hand on the book of the Gospels, promises fidelity and obedience to St. Peter, to the Holy Apostolic Roman Church, and to the reigning Pope and his successors. Only after this pledge of loyalty has been publicly pronounced does the delegate of the Holy See take the pallium from the altar and lay it on the shoulders of the archbishop. With this action the archbishop enters on the plenitude of his metropolitan powers.

The Church of St. Sophia

By L. J. KENNY, S. J.

THE splendid Cathedral of St. Patrick in New York is getting old; its corner-stone was blessed in 1858. It is a far cry from that day, three and a half centuries, back to the time when the sod was broken for St. Peter's Cathedral on the Vatican Hill in Rome. It will be admitted that St. Peter's excels the beautiful structure on Fifth Avenue not less in magnificence than in age. The Cathedral of St. Sophia, whose dome and minarets loom fair and majestic today over the city of Constantinople, was consecrated in the year of Our Lord, 562, three times three centuries before the inception of St. Peter's; and there are not wanting men of artistic judgment who insist that this basilica at the Golden Horn surpassed that on the Tiber as far in wealth and wonder as St. Peter's transcends St. Patrick's; that St. Sophia's was the worthiest monument in stone ever erected to the honor of Jesus Christ.

The fate of this glorious edifice is hanging in the balance. By the chance of war St. Sophia, richer in Catholic memories than in the priceless treasures of art it once contained, has fallen completely into the hands of the Peace Commission now in session in Paris. What disposal they are to make of it is surely a matter of large interest to Catholics. There is of course but one honest disposition. Yet powerful men, to whom cathedral-stealing is a family inheritance, are already moving to have the ends of justice balked. They have already unblushingly petitioned the Commissioners to make themselves abettors of robbery. The fact that the petition awakened no outburst of indignation should arouse Catholics not to rest silent in the security of the plain justice of their rights, lest their silence be presumed a relinquishment of their claim.

For St. Sophia is by right a Catholic church. It was built by Catholics. It was intended to be a Catholic Cathedral not less than St. Patrick's in New York, or St. Peter's in Rome. The sanctified labor of Catholic workmen dug its foundations, the wealth of the Catholic Empire assembled the materials for its construction, and the inspiration of Catholic genius poured itself into the walls and towers and dome until these burgeoned with the full fruitage of a new architecture in such finish of perfection as might never henceforth be rivaled. From the day of its consecration in the sixth century until when in the twelfth, Constantinople fell into hopeless apostasy, St. Sophia was the archiepiscopal seat of a long line of Catholic bishops: scholars, orators, saints, of whom one alone, St. John Chrysostom, might crown another church with imperishable glory. Three Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church convened within the very walls that stand today, and much of the ritual now in daily use in the Universal Church took its origin beneath that dome.

It is true that from the twelfth century until July 6, 1439, with the exception of the half-century of the Latin Empire, the "Orthodox" schismatics claimed the sacred temple as their own; but on that date it again came into Catholic possession and so remained for fourteen years, until the coming of the Turks, who in one of the bloodiest, saddest days in the long annals of Christianity, perverted the Christian basilica into an Ottoman mosque.

It would be well worth while to recall the last act of that great tragedy; how the Moslem, who for six centuries had looked with covetous eyes upon the most beautiful city in the world, had been all that period advancing upon his destined victim with the steady encroachment of a serpent upon the bird it has fascinated. All Europe saw the vibrant fangs poised for the fatal dart when Constantine Paleologus succeeded his brother to the imperial dignity. No one saw more clearly than Constantine himself; and, if history keeps open the straight silent aisles of the past to show along its vistas the monuments

of heroes, surely nowhere, not even in storied Greece, can she point out a man worthier of her attention than this last of the line of the Constantines. Leonidas, the impersonation of the valor of ancient Greece, had the sea at his right hand and the mountains at his left in his momentary struggle at Thermopylae when he stood as the champion of the West against the barbarism of the East. But Constantine knew for years that his breast alone must be the barrier of Western and of Christian civilization against the most fanatical form of Eastern degradation.

But let the historian detail the incidents of the conflict; the heart-breaking inequality of the contending forces of right and wrong, the prodigies of valor shown by the little band of the Faithful, the sea fights and the land fights, the Grecian fire, the terrible engines of destruction, the hopes buoyed up by the appearance of a comet, the treason that did not lurk but cried from the housetops of the beleaguered city. "Better," it said, "the turban of the Turk, than Rome's tiara"; how Mahomet II had prepared for the siege with artillery that in some respects at least surpassed anything seen in the recent war; how for fifty-two days Constantine maintained the hopeless struggle, and how he fell at last with his city; how his body was found all mangled and hacked beneath a heap of the slain, recognizable only by the golden eagle on his mailed shoe.

It is for us to note only that the struggle centered around and reached its climax in the Church of St. Sophia. Here as the bells tolled the midnight of May 29, 1453, Constantine, with his dearest Catholic followers, heard Mass and received the Holy Communion that was to be their Viaticum. After which he spoke to his men as one inspired, and Phranza, who was present, said if a man there was not moved to tears, when he heard this brave Emperor asking pardon of any soldier whom he might have offended, that man's heart was made of wood or iron.

The Turks on the other hand had given the name of the Cathedral, "the basilica," to their most frightful piece of ordnance, a gun into whose muzzle a tall man could walk upright, and which at each explosion cast half a ton of iron and stone against the city's fragile walls. It was to St. Sophia's too that they rushed in the first wild moment of victory, in the hopes of securing there the richest booty. Hither, as to an asylum that barbarians might be hoped to respect, all that was weak and helpless in the capital had fled; mothers and their little children, the blind and the lame and the feeble, young wives and consecrated virgins; whose prayers were turned into shrieks as they beheld the horses of the Janizaries come dashing through the wide portals of the Cathedral itself and over the bodies of the prostrate forms before their advance. The guides today speak eloquent truth, though not literally according to the facts, who point out high up on one of the pillars of the sanctuary a crimson spot where, they declare, Mahomet rested his blood-dripping fingers when he sheathed his scimitar and gave the cry of Moslem victory.

Up to this year of grace, through 466 black years, the turban of the Turk has lorded it over Constantinople. Will it remain? Is it possible for the Peace Commission to imagine they can legitimize a possession gained in such outrage, robbery and blood? Surely not. What then? Will the Commission put St. Sophia under the control of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch? He has been living in the city since the days of the conquest. Called in by Mahomet, he has been the Sultan's creature through the intervening years. Will the Commission make itself one of a triple alliance with this sycophant and his master? Or shall we see justice done, and the beautiful temple restored to the Catholic Church, that built it, that possessed it through long centuries, and that was in possession at the coming of the Turk?

It is possible that the Cathedral of St. Sophia may not be so much as mentioned in the deliberations at Paris, but that

it will be disposed of with the city of Constantinople or with the whole of Thrace. To whom will this be committed? The men in Paris are the representatives of that civilization which has cried for years for the dismissal of the Turk from Europe. We cannot believe they will permit him to remain. Both Greece and Bulgaria lay claim to Thrace. To assign it to either of these is to set the stage for a certain war between them. Peace Commissions cannot make such arrangements. Neither Greece nor Bulgaria can come into possession.

Constantinople will doubtless be internationalized. But how? Mr. Henry Morgenthau, recently American Ambassador to Turkey, who during the beginning of the World-War conducted the business of the embassies of half a dozen other nations at the Sublime Porte, urged that Constantinople should be placed under the administration of Belgium. Mr. Morgenthau was intimately familiar with the diplomatic difficulties of the situation as no other man in the world could be, his counsel accordingly ought to meet a ready acceptance as that of the best specialist expert.

But the war has ceased since Mr. Morgenthau wrote. The world is waiting to see how American and British statesmen are going to manifest in acts that love for little Belgium which they were unable hitherto to express sufficiently in words. They had an opportunity when it came to sharing among the belligerents the huge indemnity Germany is to pay for the damages inflicted during the war; but they let this occasion pass, for Belgium's allotment, according to projected distribution, was a notably meager fraction. Opportunity, which the old poets thought knocked but once, recognized the high distinction of the Paris Commission, and came a second time to their door, when Belgium's capital petitioned for the location of the permanent Peace Congress, but Mr. Wilson's devotion to the city of John Calvin gave the Congress to Geneva. The honorable gentlemen must certainly be keeping something very desirable in reserve for bleeding Belgium. Doubtless it has been intending all along to make Belgium mandatory over Constantinople. There is an obvious appropriateness in sending the sons of Flanders to rule again where Baldwin and his successors were Emperors in the brave days of the Crusaders.

There is another congruity that ought not be overlooked. Decorations and honors have been distributed to the heroes of the World-War. Cardinal Mercier has been honored by being passed by when stars and ribbons were conferred. But if it were given to him to offer up to God the first *liturgia* of reparation for the frightful deeds done beneath St. Sophia's dome 466 years ago, he would be honored indeed, and his beloved Belgium's sorrow would be lifted, as she witnesses him there, at the altar, preaching by his presence, that the Heavenly Father remembers the tears and blood of His children with a long, long memory; and the whole world could not but thrill with gladness as it beholds Justice in his gentle person triumphant over ancient Crime.

COMMUNICATIONS

(Letters as a rule should not exceed six-hundred words.)

The Wizardry of Capitalism

To the Editor of AMERICA:

For about ten years, before I became a Catholic, I was in the employ of a company which eventually became one of the properties of the United States Steel Corporation. For more than ten years, since becoming a Catholic, I have been employed by the same interests. Having an intimate personal knowledge of the U. S. S. Co. and of its policies toward its employees and its treatment of them, and having a considerable amount of information as to its treatment of its competitors and of its customers, I regret exceedingly the tone of the editorial "The

Wizardry of Capitalism," printed in AMERICA for April 26, 1919.

If you will study the history of the United States Steel Corporation, if you will read the public utterances of its Chairman, Hon. Elbert H. Gary (who is not a Catholic), and of its President, Mr. James A. Farrell, who is a Catholic, if you will ascertain the fact that its competitors are its best friends, and that its scale of wages is always as high or higher than the scale paid in similar mills, possibly your opinion of the Corporation may change.

Vast sums have been expended in the interests of "Safety First and Always," a great deal of "Welfare Work" has been accomplished, and much study has been given and energy applied along all lines for betterment of conditions. During the recent war every available ounce of energy was expended in assisting in the preparation of materials for the successful prosecution of the war, and those of us who had our own small parts in the work know that costs and profits were disregarded, and the only thought was to do the work well and do it quickly. During the war the U. S. S. C. sold steel products to its customers at prices much below those that might have been commanded, and were actually obtained by other companies. Mr. Gary opposed unreasonable profits, just as he now advocates for reasonable, not unreasonable, reductions in prices. He has always stood for fair wages, commensurate with costs of living. The average daily earnings per employee for the year 1918 were \$5.38 as compared with \$3.00 in 1915. And the many advances in wages were made voluntarily by the Corporation, and were not the result of strikes or dissensions.

It is deplorable that the wisdom, breadth of vision, spirit of justice and co-operation of Mr. Gary and his associates should be severely criticized, especially in view of the fact that they constitute today one of the most potent forces against the growth of Socialism. I am proud of the Corporation, of its history, of its principles, and of the men who are guiding its destinies during these troublous times. Time will eventually accord to them their proper place in the history of the nation, and I have no fear as to the verdict. We in the ranks know our leaders from personal experience, and we are satisfied.

Pittsburgh.

CHARLES D. TERRY.

[All that the writer of this letter tells us regarding wages, safety devices and welfare work may be entirely true, but it is aside of the mark. This subject was not mentioned in the editorial. However, it may be said in passing, that these considerations reflect credit upon a corporation in so far as they reduce its dividends and leave its prices normal. The only two subjects discussed editorially were the dividends and the "watered" common stock of the United States Steel Corporation. Neither of these is touched by the correspondent except for the brief statement that "costs and profits were disregarded" by the corporation in its patriotic labors to win the war. That the corporation might have demanded even higher prices is quite possible. Perhaps we ought to be thankful that it did not do so. Its generosity, however, did not prevent it, according to the figures quoted from the reliable editorial printed in the *Catholic Charities Review*, from reaping a dividend equivalent to from nine to seventeen per cent *per annum* for the different quarters of the year 1918. If we further recall the statement made, on the authority of the Commissioner of Corporations on the Steel Industry, that the United States Steel Corporation's entire issue of common stock, representing approximately \$508,000,000, may, except for its "merger value", be considered as nothing but "water", we can still better admire the patriotism that disregarded costs and profits while drawing a dividend equivalent to nine per cent *per annum* during the last quarter of the year 1918, and of seventeen per cent. during the first and second quarters of that war-year on such common stock. This, our editorial described as the wizardry of capitalism, turning mere "water" into millions of solid bullion. For fur-

ther enlightenment, we refer our correspondent to the Commissioner of Corporations on the Steel Industry.

"In view of the nature and history of the common stock," wrote the editor of the *Catholic Charities Review* in the March issue, "the directors of the United States Steel Corporation are evidently violating a very urgent moral and social obligation when they permit it to pay dividends at the rate of nine per cent *per annum* at this time." In the following month the editor announced that a reduction of prices had been brought about, but only by the active intervention of the Federal Government: "The Steel manufacturers failed to reduce prices themselves, either individually or collectively, four months ago, when this course would have prevented probably the greater part of the unemployment now existing."—ED. AMERICA.]

St. Sophia

To the Editor of AMERICA:

On April 28, a Greek Orthodox bishop came to Philadelphia and there was an agape of Greek master-bootblacks and goober-venders, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians, under the chairmanship of the State Clerk of the Presbyterian General Assembly. If Greek bootblacks are schismatical one can meet them in our set; if they are not schismatical they must at least be scrubbed. It seems the Greek Orthodox Church and the Episcopalians are flirting toward spiritual unification, hence the Philadelphian agape. Neither church has anything to sacrifice in doctrine now, and as the Orthodox Greeks have real Orders, this is an excellent opportunity for ritualistic "priests" to get rid of their quotation marks. At the agape they adopted a resolution, which is to be sent to President Wilson and Premier Venizelos in Paris, demanding that the Peace Conference, at some interval when it is not handing anything to England, should throw the Turks out of the Church of St. Sophia at Constantinople and "restore" it to the Orthodox Greeks for Christian worship.

St. Sophia, the Church of the Divine Wisdom, was built by the Emperor Justinian as a Catholic church and consecrated, December 27, 537. The Greek Orthodox Church came into existence in 1054, 517 years later, and it sequestered, as they say in France, the Church of St. Sophia. The schismatics used the church until the Turks turned it into a mosque in 1453. The original thieves held it 399 years, and the Turks have had it now 466 years. Why shift thieves? Why not give it to the Hard-Shell Baptists, the Holy Rollers, the African Methodists, or the Cowley Fathers, or at least let them draw lots for it? They have as much right to it as either the Orthodox Greeks or the Turks. By the way, why not turn it over to the Catholics, who own it, and have it disinfected?

Philadelphia.

AUSTIN O'MALLEY.

Another Word on "Jews and Irish"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Mr. Alfred Young's letter in AMERICA for April 26, concerning my article in AMERICA for February 22, on "Jews and Irish" has been called to my attention. He is distressed as we all would be, at the business association of Catholics with Jews in producing a disreputable motion-picture. When I wrote I was, so to speak, in a serener ether of thought and not concerned with venal Jewish theatrical managers or unscrupulous Catholics. I saw the "Jews and Irish," two ancient races, on a higher plane but one in the kinship of suffering and both possessed with a Providential historic purpose. When the late Mr. Cecil Chesterton was in New York he told me he had a lecture on "The Jew." He believed that the modern Jew had commercialized, among other things, dramatic art. I told him his lecture was anti-Semite and out of place in our country. If good was to be done, the Jew must be attacked, not as a Jew, but as a dramatic

manager. For some reason Chesterton never delivered the lecture. I have been acquainted with public men in New York for twenty-five years and I could tell a plausible tale of how Irish-American politicians and even judges have not only commercialized but corrupted politics. I have known some to betray the interests of religion for political preferment. I could point to wide stretches of space in this city where low saloons bore no names but Irish.

Now, would it not be injudicious and in excessively bad taste to attack an honorable race, because of these public imperfections? Today, much of the opposition to the Jew is racial. We had the same kind of opposition to the Irish in New York when I was a boy. We are beholden to the Irish for many good things but all that we have spiritually has sprung from the loins of Jewish stock. The Greeks may have given us art and literature and the Romans other gifts like law and jurisprudence, but the Jew has given us the things of the spirit which last forever. His literature cannot be rivaled even by Christianity, a fact which Cardinal Newman admits.

However, I thank Mr. Young for the opportunity to explain more fully.

New York.

HENRY E. O'KEEFFE, C.S.P.

"The Brazen Serpent"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The headline, "The Brazen Serpent," in AMERICA for April 19, was so misleading or wanting in suggestion of the character of the story following it, that I came very near missing altogether, or postponing to a later date, that wonderful pen picture of the Crucifixion and Resurrection by Austin O'Malley. Fortunately, I glanced at the first three lines, and becoming fascinated, read it eagerly to the end; then I read it again and again to others. I think it is the most exquisite and realistic word-painting of the tragedy of Calvary I have ever read, not excepting Father Faber's work. Had I written so touching a prose poem, I could cheerfully chant my *Nunc Dimittis*. In the hands of a skilful playwright, perhaps Dr. O'Malley himself, it might easily be made the groundwork and inspiration for a modern "mystery play" that would rival "Veronica's Veil" and Father Benson's "Upper Chamber." Projected on the screen by means of the cinema's latest triumph in color-photography, it would make a sacred spectacle, and be a form of "Catholic Publicity" that would prepare the ground and sow the seed for an abundant harvest of souls.

White Bear Lake, Minn.

WM. F. MARKOE.

[If our correspondent would read Numbers, xxi.: 6, 7, 8, 9, and then recall that the brazen serpent prefigured the crucified Christ who "cures" men better by the fiery serpent of sin, he would conclude that the title criticized is not misleading, nor yet wanting in suggestion.—ED. AMERICA.]

Agitation Without Organization

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Mexico has taught us that protests to the Government do not count, and Prohibition that votes are not needed. My whole training has been Catholic, and I know the sterling value of Catholic schools, and I have a vote. There are many like me. Where can we send our names in effective protest against the Smith bill? France should teach us the result of neglect or indifference, and some one must set the ball rolling. Week after week I read suggestions, but no organization forms. Will the Children of Mary, or the Federation of Catholic Alumnae, or the K. of C. take our names? Where shall we Catholic women, who desire to stand for the principles and rights of the Faith in this our country, where shall we send our names, in time to defeat this unjust educational bill?

New York.

PAULA BRENDAN.

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, MAY 10, 1919

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.

President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Sandy MacPherson and Ireland

SANDY MACPHERSON is in Ireland breathing fire and oaths and preparing, it may be, for another slaughter of heroic people, simply because, despite long and bitter persecution, they have retained grit enough to insist on their rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Everybody knows all about Sandy, his origin, his training, his knighthood, his peculiar prophylactic care of the naughty Tommies and all the rest of the moral rot which entitle men to be elevated above their decent fellows, by a blow from a king's sword. But nobody understands why Sandy should be so savage, just at present. Why breathe fire? After all Ireland is asking for liberty only. And surely England cannot object to that. She fought the World-War for freedom's sake, and not for her own freedom so much as for the freedom of small defenseless nations, like Belgium, Serbia and Ireland. And now, just across the channel sit her delegates in Paris, all aweary with their efforts to liberate the whole world from tyranny. What can Sandy be thinking of anyhow? How dare he fly in the face of Balfour, Cecil and those other apostles of freedom, who spent America's money so lavishly in order to pull the iron shoe from the Kaiser's foot? And is not Sandy afraid of Mr. Wilson, he of the self-determination doctrine? Of a truth, Sandy is a brave man, he is staking his post and his knighthood for principle. But if he intends to smite the Irish once again, he should do it now, for some testy folk are actually beginning to doubt England's honesty and Mr. Wilson's courage. The world needs another proof of both. And what better could be given than more Irish blood, the blood of poor, helpless people who out of chains call to the nations that they too are human, that they too love liberty, that they too intend to get liberty. More Irish blood by all means. The Peace Conference will not be a success without it. The world will then answer the politicians.

"The Religion of Respectability"

THOSE who have read René Bazin's powerful novel, "The Barrier," will easily recall the strong scene in which Félicien Limerel, who has lost his faith in Catholicism, charges his parents with being largely responsible for that disaster. He cries out:

I had early Christian training, I recognize it. I received more religious instruction and saw more examples of faith among my masters than most of the men of my generation. That should have sufficed, and often has done, to build up a sound faith, but on one condition. It is that the family life should be in harmony with these instructions. . . . I have seen at home too many examples which did not agree with the lessons taught at school, and I have learned to doubt. . . . I have seen that you all placed many things before religion. . . . The enumerating would be long. . . . It includes the whole of life, or what is called by that name: the whirl of amusement, luxury, honors, the future—yours and perhaps mine also. I have seen that you failed to defend the principles I had once been taught to venerate, the men who had been held up to me as examples; and that you allowed matters to be freely discussed, here in your house. . . . I saw, even, that you approved this language which at first horrified me. The influences of your salon were not always a training in virtue. Who was ever concerned to practise these teachings? . . . Who sustained me in my youthful aspirations? Who ever tried to divine my doubts and to answer them? Who ever interested themselves in my reading? I read everything without guidance. . . . In short, I have never understood from the life here at home that religion was the law by which we should be guided. That is what I reproach you with. If you are, after all, a believer at heart, father. . . . then you should have been one fundamentally, and have made of my childish faith the law, the light, the strength of my life. I have none of all these—neither law nor strength, nor joy. If you are a believer and if what you believe exists, from what a heaven you banished me!

Félicien's parents, the story goes on to tell, were forced to acknowledge the justice of their son's merciless indictment, for the Limerels' religion, the mother tearfully owns, had been merely one of "respectability." It is just possible that the perusal of the foregoing passage may give even some American Catholic parents a qualm or two of conscience. Perhaps their children are sent, though grudgingly, to Catholic schools, but the domestic atmosphere is so hostile to the principles that the boys and girls of the family learn in the classroom that they decide, after recovering from the painful bewilderment they experience in trying to reconcile contradictions, that the only sensible way of practising their religion is according to the pattern set them by their weak, critical, and pleasure-loving parents. As a result the children themselves, in spite of their early schooling, grow up compromising worldly-minded Catholics. Having been accustomed at home from their tender years to hear the Church's tenets and decrees belittled and her rulers carped at, it is small wonder that when they become men and women their Catholicism is merely a "religion of respectability," quite devoid of vitality, and depth, useful indeed on Sundays, profitable, sometimes, socially and professionally, but by no means a religion for which sacrifices must be made.

Literature and Materialism

SEVERAL of the British reviews have recently been deploring the marked decline they have observed in the quality of today's literary output. A writer in the *Saturday Review*, for instance, utters a downright jeremiad on the subject. He first complains that owing to the introduction of cheap postage and to the wide use of the telegraph, the telephone and the typewriter, the ancient art of letter-writing is now quite obsolete. "We do not remember ever to have received a well-written, informative, or witty letter in our life" is his doleful confession. Practical interest in perfection of style, he then complains, has also fallen into disrepute.

The perversity of a few individuals made style in writing immoral. Alongside of this eccentric and disturbing force, there was the steady pressure of the mechanical age, the diversion of the best brains from what used to be called "the professions," i.e., the bar, the church, medicine, and literature, to engineering, chemistry, and stock-jobbing. At the back of this materialistic movement there arose the apparition, grimy enough, of millions of half-educated hand-workers, worse than uneducated, half-educated, disbelieving Christianity, laughing at duty, only set on the apolaustic life in whatever coarsest form they could reach it. Football matches, coursing, race meetings, films, theaters, eating, and drinking, these were the things that preoccupied the millions; and to please them a new illustrated press, reaping huge profits, sprang into being. But the new press was obliged to speak the language of the new millions, and cunningly. Therefore, they bid for the best writers, according to repute, of the day. One of the new millionaire papers can and will pay for a thousand words as much as an old quarterly or monthly magazine will pay for 5,000 words. What is the result? The young men with a real aptitude for style go into the millionaire-press business,

learn how to squeeze into a thousand words conclusions on important subjects, and often end by acquiring the "popular" "hands-in-the-pocket, turned-up-trousers style of the illustrated paper."

The London *Times Literary Supplement* is almost as pessimistic. Taking for granted that Wells, Bennett and Galsworthy are the leading British novelists of today, the writer says of them:

No single phrase will sum up the charge or grievance which we have to bring against a mass of work so large in its volume and embodying so many qualities, both admirable and the reverse. If we tried to formulate our meaning in one word we should say that these three writers are materialists, and for that reason have disappointed us and left us with the feeling that the sooner English fiction turns its back upon them, as politely as may be, and marches, if only into the desert, the better for its soul.

In the coming age of "triumphant democracy" literary culture, we are assured, will not longer be the monopoly of certain professions and circles only, but the wider spread of education among the common people will produce literary geniuses who will force recognition from the aristocrats of intellect and thus promote the democratizing of letters. But if this new literary republic is to be a thoroughly materialistic one, with such authors as Wells, Bennett, and Galsworthy as its models and idols, and with the "millionaire press" as its organ, the

perils attending a "little learning" against which the poet warns us will certainly be numerous and grave. For the only safe learning is that based upon the Christian Revelation and the only solid culture is that which includes a practical appreciation of the beauty and harmony in Our Divine Saviour's life and doctrine. All will be well if the new world-democracy, as the lawful heir to the literary and ethical culture of the past, will only insist that the entire legacy be handed over. Dishonest executors are now trying to make the trustful legatee believe that the only culture, the only literature he has inherited are inspired by a soulless materialism. But in reality the richest part of the legacy that has fallen to the lusty democracy of today are nineteen centuries of Christian civilization with all its saints, heroes, and sages' burning words and inspiring deeds, and the spiritual, literary and artistic treasures those men and women have left us. It is the duty of Catholics to make the new age now opening realize the full value of our heritage. But this we cannot do until we have learned its worth ourselves, and have become familiar with what our forefathers in the Faith have done to promote Christian civilization and spread true culture. The "ideals," so-called, of materialism will have little appeal to a world that Catholics have succeeded in filling with an intelligent admiration for the race's highest spiritual achievements in the past.

Letters of Naturalization

AMONG the requests repeated with the most constant reiteration in our mission literature is the urgent petition for the support of native catechists. Few Catholics realize the full meaning of the cry: "Help my catechists!" It comes from the very depth of the souls of our foreign missionaries. With the hundreds of millions of dollars that Protestantism will pour into its mission funds during the coming years, this cry assumes for us a new importance.

In countless instances our mission work depends for its permanent success and extension almost entirely upon the catechist. It is he who presents to the native Christians or to prospective converts the Gospel of Christ in words and ways best understood by them. "Religion must bring with it," says the *Good Work*, "its letters of naturalization. We call them catechists." It may be possible for the missionary to visit his flock at long intervals only. In the meantime it is the catechist who instructs them, who gathers them together and presides at their devotions, who strengthens the weak and supports them in temptation, who teaches the children and prepares them for Holy Baptism. Few understand the trials and persecutions to which converts from paganism are frequently subjected on the part of relatives, or savage chiefs of municipal authorities. "I know of a village," says a missionary, "which has kept the Faith amid many vicissitudes and trials, which has come forth from the fire of persecution pure; tried gold, due to one

fact alone: that a humble, lowly catechist worked there quietly, unobtrusively for twenty years."

Often it is the duty of the catechist to travel from village to village performing his apostolic task. Thus is the missionary multiplied by the number of zealous and well-instructed catechists he can put into the field. This number depends upon one condition only, the alms contributed for this purpose. There are localities where thirty dollars a year will make it possible to maintain a catechist, while in others the fund required may rise, in a graded scale, to \$100. The regular support of one or more catechists may be accounted among the most apostolic works that individuals and societies can undertake. And here be it remembered that it is precisely in this way that Protestantism is doing its most effective work in the mission field. Can Catholics remain inactive while souls are crying for help?

Vultures Abroad

THERE are many despicable creatures in the world, but none quite so contemptible as the human vultures that refuse to wait for the death of their victim, before plucking out his eyes and rending his flesh. But, ghoulish as are such outcasts of human society, their tribe seems to be on the increase. Or is it that the present misfortunes of men and nations have given the sorry, reeking wights a larger opportunity to strip the corpse and rob the dying man of his possessions.

Maybe. At any rate the ogres are returning to their dens fed with numerous and diverse spoils. Witness this account recently published in the *Laredo Daily Times* under the significant title "Evidence of Sacrilege Found in Contraband":

The arrest in this city on Monday by customs authorities of Isaac B. Levy, president of the Foreign Products Co. of 170

Broadway, New York, brings back an echo of the Mexican revolutions of the past few years and the pillaging and robbing of the Roman Catholic churches by the Mexican rebels and brigands generally, for among the numerous articles confiscated by the customs authorities when the trunks of Levy were seized are numerous evidences of stolen church property.

Besides numerous expensive vestments worn by priests and bishops, sacred antiques and other articles, there are in the collection seized from Levy church property worth thousands of dollars. These comprise a candlestand of solid gold and pearl, with inlaid pearl and gold and net filigree work, a solid gold heart-shaped case of the Sacred Heart Society studded with green stones and beautifully carved and engraved ornamentations, two smaller golden heart-shaped emblems similarly embellished as the larger case, three solid silver candlesticks, bearing the inscription in Spanish which translated reads: "These candlesticks belong to the Hospital La Purisima."

There are also a number of valuable sacred paintings, one bearing date of July 5, 1619, others being painted on ivory, while there are beautiful religious emblems painted on the best quality of silk, all these being of ancient times and perhaps having been in the Roman Catholic churches of Mexico for centuries. The parts of priests and bishops vestments in the lot being smuggled by Levy are of the kind that were used centuries ago and made of a fabric that is now obsolete. Besides the church property in the collection of smuggled goods there are eight diamond rings (three of which were manifested by Levy), numerous beautiful opals and a large quantity of valuable jewelry and antiques.

A pretty story that, but one only of a hundred more of like kind. Three years since, another of Levy's tribe, a disgrace, too, to his race, was caught entering the port of New York, laden with church goods, and little was heard of the matter, because, no doubt, in this age of pitiless publicity and open covenants openly arrived at, prosecution would have embarrassed the American politicians who helped the bandits to loot Mexico, in the name of freedom. Moreover, the Catholic Church was the victim and that makes a difference, even, and perhaps principally, with Catholic politicians.

Literature

FITZGERALD AND THE TENTMAKER

THREE novels less ephemeral than most novels fell from the press in the year of grace 1859: George Eliot's "Adam Bede," George Meredith's "The Ordeal of Richard Feverel," and Charles Dickens's "A Tale of Two Cities." Even sixty years ago that might have been licitly considered a good year's work; but 1859 did not stop there. Before resigning its watch-tower to the first of the sixties, the old year managed to bring forth three other books as different one from the other as even books can be—Tennyson's "Idyls of the King," Darwin's "Origin of Species," and Fitzgerald's version of "The Rubáiyát." To equal that output in quantity, quality and infinite variety we must go back to some year made famous by Shakespeare, Jonson, Southwell and the "nest of singing birds."

Today the best-known of those six well-known books is the one that was least known in the years of its youth. Fitzgerald's fame came slowly. Perhaps it might never have come at all had not Dante Gabriel Rossetti picked up a copy of the first edition in a Piccadilly book-stall and organized the Omar-cult in

England. As for Fitzgerald himself, he was not solicitous about fame; he was not solicitous about anything. His friend, Professor Cowell, had practically compelled him to study Persian, and one day in May, 1857, the lazy scholar read the original "Rubáiyát" in a Bedfordshire paddock "covered with butterflies and brushed by a delicious breeze while a dainty racing filly of W. Browne's came startling up to wonder and sniff." The Middle Ages reached out on that sunlit afternoon and touched the Victorian days with unwonted splendor, and Fitzgerald produced his translation—so-called.

Yes, so-called; for Fitzgerald's Omar, as Swinburne says, belongs "as much or more to Suffolk than to Shiraz." He adopted the quatrain form, he borrowed some of the Oriental imagery, he made a selection of ideas; and while purporting to translate the Persian poet he really expressed himself. In the "Rubáiyát" of Omar there are over 800 quatrains; in his first edition Fitzgerald has but seventy-five, in the edition of 1868 he has 110, and in his final versions of 1872 and 1879 he reduced the quatrains to 101. Obviously, he must have left out a good deal of

Omar; and the English reader who accepts Fitzgerald's version as an adequate or even as a representative rendering of Omar the Tentmaker forms an egregiously erroneous impression of the astronomer-philosopher-poet whose quatrains are placed by scholars among the sacred books of Persia.

Fitzgerald has helped to swell the confusion worse confounded that clouds the name and the fame of the Persian bard. Omar has been called everything from a graceless old reprobate to an ascetic and a saint. The "Rubáiyát" has been styled "the bible of the bibulous"; and to the reader who knows Omar only through Fitzgerald's verses it looks indeed as though the poet were an erotic pagan, shamelessly given to drunkenness and sensuality, intent on singing the praises of skepticism, wine and carnal love. On the other hand, authorities on Persian literature are practically unanimous in assuring us that Omar must be accepted as a religious poet, that his passionate praises of wine and women are the recognized metaphors of the Sufi sect, that wine means the joy of the unitive way and love the absorption of the soul in God, that the alleged agnostic scoffings are only protests, more or less artfully disguised, against the rigors and formalities of the Mohammedan law.

Where lies the truth? Is the eleventh-century poet a saint or a drunkard, a believer or an agnostic, an ascetic or a libertine? Even the student who does not read Persian—thanks to the number and variety of French and English versions of the "Rubáiyát"—may essay to solve the difficulty. And I here propose a solution which to the best of my knowledge has not been offered before and which goes far to explain the variety of judgments passed upon both Omar and Fitzgerald.

If we take up some relatively complete translation of the Persian original, such as Thompson's, Payne's or Whinfield's, we shall find in the "Rubáiyát" the presentation of three distinct and even contradictory views of human life and human destiny; we shall find a series of monologues in which three men express their opinions of certain fundamental human problems. One is the Philosopher, he who has studied much in all the schools and whose position is that of the man who has dealt so long with ethical abstractions and metaphysical formulas that he has lost his grip on reality and has become a doubter who doubts that he doubts. The second is the Sensualist, he who has concerned himself mainly with material delights, who finds surcease and inspiration in the cup that cheers and also inebriates and whose one theory of living is to eat, drink and be merry while he can. And the third is the Ascetic, he who has chosen the way of renunciation as the path to happiness, whose mind is set on union with God and who regards the pleasures of the flesh as serious obstacles to the consummation of that union. The poem might well be printed in dialogue form and then it would be found that the three characters argue from their respective points of view, and in places vigorously combat one another's contentions.

Now, as we have seen, when Edward Fitzgerald wrote his version of the "Rubáiyát" he made a selection of quatrains; and he selected certain representative stanzas of the Philosopher and the Sensualist and completely ignored the stanzas of the Ascetic. Any reader can divide the 101 quatrains of the standard edition of Fitzgerald's "Rubáiyát" into two groups: those emanating from the Sensualist and those evolved by the Philosopher. Fitzgerald has given them an organic unity in harmony with the formula: Since you are going to be a long time dead and you don't know anything with absolute certainty about what passes beyond the grave, you had best enjoy yourself while you are still in the flesh.

But the third voice—and what seems to be the dominating voice in the Persian Omar—finds no echo in Fitzgerald. I present from Whinfield's translation a few of the quatrains attributable to the Ascetic, and even the most casual examination of them will bear out the contention that they are in direct

opposition to certain familiar lines in Fitzgerald's "Rubáiyát" and completely out of harmony with their spirit. Thus does the Ascetic comment on the Sensualist's glorification of wine, women and song:

Men's lusts, like house-dogs, still the house distress
With clamor, barking for mere wantonness;
Foxes are they, and sleep the sleep of hares;
Crafty as wolves, as tigers pitiless.

These ruby lips and wine and minstrel boys
And lute and harp, your dearly cherished toys,
Are mere redundancies, and you are naught,
Till you renounce the world's delusive joys.

Who treads in passion's footsteps here below,
A helpless pauper will depart, I trow;
Remember who you are and whence you come,
Consider what you do and whither go.

I pray thee to my counsel lend thine ear,
Cast off this false hypocrisy's veneer;
This life a moment is, the next all time;
Sell not eternity for earthly gear!

The Philosopher's specious plea that man is but a pawn of fate, and that human liberty is straitened by God's knowledge of the future, is denied by the Ascetic:

The good and evil with man's nature blent,
The weal and wo that heaven's decrees have sent—
Impute them not to motion of the skies—
Skies than thyself ten times more impotent.

To him who would his sins extenuate,
Let pious men this verse reiterate,
"To call God's prescience the cause of sin
In wisdom's purview is but folly's prate."

And the Ascetic's own philosophy of life, a philosophy completely unrepresented in the Fitzgerald stanzas, is embodied in such verses as these:

Oft doth my soul her prisoned state bemoan,
Her earth-born co-mate she would fain disown,
And quit, did not the stirrup of the law
Upbear her foot from dashing on the stone.

If you seek Him, abandon child and wife,
Arise and sever all these ties to life;
All these are bonds to check you on your course,
Arise and cut these bonds, as with a knife.

My true condition I may thus explain
In two short verses which the whole contain:
"For love to Thee I now lay down my life,
In hope Thy love will raise me up again!"

It is sometimes said that Fitzgerald's quatrains are filled with subtle poison, that they are capable of doing irreparable harm to readers who take them seriously. But do any readers take them seriously? The man who desires to strengthen his agnostic position will get no information from Omar; he may from Voltaire and Tom Paine and Ingersoll. And the man who seeks justification for riotous living will find in the "Rubáiyát" only that which he already knows. The "philosophy" of "Take the Cash and let the Credit go" is but an echo of Horace's ode to Leuconoë. The poem appropriately concludes with the figure of the Empty Glass—there is really nothing in it. No deepening of our knowledge of life is to be found in the "Rubáiyát" and no seed of inspiration to plant in our hearts and grow into a goodly tree and fruitful.

Then, is Fitzgerald's Omar really literature? And why do people read it? It is literature because it is a thing of beauty; and people read it because they find rare delight in the music of its measures and the splendor of its imagery—"the Snowdrift of the Petals of the Rose." Its appeal is exclusively an esthetic appeal, something as far removed from intellect as the anvil chorus in "Il Trovatore," as irrelevant to morality as the egg-and-dart molding of the Parthenon. A Trappist monk or

professional Prohibitionist might revel in it with perfect consistency. The secret of the "Rubáiyát" is the exquisite beauty, the esthetic suggestiveness, the baffling simplicity and the haunting harmony of such lines as these:

I sometimes think that never blows so red
The Rose as where some buried Caesar bled;
That every Hyacinth the Garden wears
Dropt in her Lap from some once lovely Head.

The legend hath it that the Tentmaker often said: "My tomb shall be in a spot where the north wind may scatter roses over it." The prophecy has won fulfilment. For the petals of Fitzgerald's verses, matured beneath a Suffolk sun, are blown over mountain and sea, and rest—fragrant, fair, imperishable—upon the tomb at Nishapur where Omar Kháyyám sleeps. How many of us, but for those English roses, might have never scaled that Persian garden's walls!

BROTHER LEO.

REVIEWS

Spiritism and Religion: "Can You Talk to the Dead?" Including a Study of the Most Remarkable Cases of Spirit Control. By BARON JOHAN LILJENCRAKTS, A.M., S.T.D. With Foreword by MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN, LL.D., New York: The Devin Adair Co.

Dr. Liljencrants has written a remarkable book on a topic that the war has made of more than passing interest. For since the appearance of "Raymond" by Sir Oliver Lodge a new impulse has been given to the Spiritistic cult. Time was when the strange and often uncanny accounts from the séance were put down to exaggeration or denied absolutely. Then Benson and above all Raupert declared that the Spiritistic phenomena were more than idle tales, and all thinking men should approach the subject of Spiritism with open minds and endeavor to find an explanation for spirit-rapping, *rapport*, *telekinesis* and other weird happenings. Perrone and Raupert accepted mediumship and Spiritistic marvels that were not patently proven fraudulent as preternatural at least in part. The present writer concludes that a study of the best authenticated phenomena on record has failed to show evidence for other than natural causes. "So he arrives at the conclusion that Spiritism cannot be shown to contain a preternatural element."

In the ensemble of the phenomena examined, Dr. Liljencrants does not hold to the total exclusion of preternatural causation. While it is possible to account for much by appealing to automatic activity of "secondary personalities," subliminal memory and telepathy, it may likewise be possible that in individual instances there is present an influence from the world of spirit. In this assumption the agent surely would be diabolical, as it is preposterous to imagine God as the primal or immediate cause of happenings frequently trivial and immoral.

As a religion Spiritism is opposed to Christianity, for it plainly postulates a new revelation. Sir Conan Doyle has made that clear in declaring Sir Oliver Lodge's "Raymond" an epoch-making work holding "a new revelation of God's dealing with man." In the accounts that purport to come from the spirit-messages, God is not a personality. He is the Life-Principle and Author of all might and wisdom pervading all space and living in all men. Man then is individual and immortal, a spark of the Divine. Heaven and hell are not places, but mental states, and there is a progressive emergence from hell's misery. Religion does not consist in dogmatic belief, but more in feeling and in fair dealing with our fellow-men. Christ is the supreme example of a perfect man. Modern Spiritists have come more and more to reject a Creator, and work out a deity more in keeping with Pantheism and evolution. This is very plain in the writings of Myers, who is representative of Spiritistic thought in its most intellectual development. Man's supreme business is in constant outreaching toward the World-Soul. Herein lies personal salvation. Christian creeds are misrepresentations of the Gospel, and the foremost English exponent

of the religion of Spiritism, Conan Doyle, rejects the fundamental Christian idea of Redemption. Indeed Christianity must either accommodate itself to Spiritism or go down to failure.

Dr. Liljencrants admits that modern manuals of moral theology do not support his view that Spiritistic phenomena can be referred to psychological causes, but he adds that theologians refer to diabolic agency only where a natural explanation would not be adequate. Over thirty years of careful investigation on two continents have failed, according to the author, to prove diabolic agency. For Catholics the question is a very simple one, as the mind of the Church is clear and positive in the decree of the Holy Office, April 24, 1917, which condemns active or passive assistance at Spiritistic séances. Dr. Liljencrants' book was submitted to the Catholic University in Washington in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the doctorate in theology.

G. C. T.

The Cambridge History of American Literature: Vol. II, Early National Literature: Part II, Later National Literature: Part I. Edited by WILLIAM PETERSFIELD TRENT, M.A., LL.D., and others. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

The first volume of this important work was reviewed in our issue of January 26, 1918. The present volume continues the account of the Cambridge school and appraises their work, giving interesting, informing chapters on Thoreau, Whittier, Lowell, Longfellow and Hawthorne. Professor Erskine's estimate of the last-named author, however, is disappointing, and Senator Lodge's chapter on Daniel Webster also seems inadequate. In Dr. Bassett's readable pages about "Writers on American History" there is no mention of John Gilmary Shea and Dr. Wolfe's chapter on "Divines and Moralists" contains the names of no Catholics whatever, though Archbishop Kenrick and Bishop England certainly had as much influence on the men of their times as did "Leonard Woods, Moses Stuart, Austin Phelps and Edward A. Park," let us say. In her account of "Prescott and Motley" Ruth Putnam writes that the former, being almost blind, but owning a full purse, went to the expense of having his "Ferdinand and Isabella" printed in large type on one side of the page only, so that he could correct the proofs himself. Her estimate of Motley's worth as a historian is too high, though she admits that "He did not understand Europe at large, he did not understand the Church. In his hands Philip II was treated too severely, as was Maurice in his conflict with Barneveld. There was a lack of perspective in his every estimate."

Dr. Cairns' chapter on "Magazines, Annals and Gift-Books 1783-1850" and Dr. Scott's on "Newspapers, 1775-1860" are full of information which it must have cost the authors a vast deal of research and reading to make their own. Dr. Howe's pages on "Early Humorists" also open a fresh field of inquiry. Dr. Miles in his chapter on "The New South" writes discerning appraisals of Sidney Lanier and Father Tabb and Dr. C. Alphonso Smith pays a just tribute to Joel Chandler Harris. The volume's bibliography is particularly thorough and satisfactory, 227 pages being filled with references to authors discussed in the text. As the scope of "The Cambridge History of American Literature" embraces writers who, prior to 1900 had produced notable books, the editors have in preparation a third volume.

W. D.

Submarine and Anti-submarine. By SIR HENRY NEWBOLT. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Prisoner of the U-90. By EDOUARD VICTOR ISAACS. Lieut. U. S. N. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co.

Romance clings to the subject of the submarine, and there is something epic in the narrative of its exploits. Sir Henry Newbolt, who here writes the history of the submarine, though it is rather the history of that craft as developed and used by England, says: "History cannot be entirely poetical, or poetry entirely historical. When Homer told the tale of Troy, he did

not make prose—or even history of it. He everywhere infused into it an "incomparable ardor"—he made an epic." After a brief history of the submarine, the book goes on to tell of its use in the war, story following story in thrilling succession, much in the epic manner of Homer relating single combat after single combat. Then follows interesting matter on the anti-submarine, and we are told something of the Q-boats and other boats used to combat and follow and fool submarines. The book ends with the story of Zeebrugge and Ostend. The narratives, many of them, are now for the first time published, and reflect undying honor upon British seamen. The book is strongly pro-British and anti-German.

Edouard Victor Isaacs tells the story of the sinking of his ship, the transport President Lincoln, and of his subsequent adventures. He was captured by the U-90 and treated with considerable kindness by his German captors. This kindness was changed to severity when once he landed in German prisons. After a couple of unsuccessful attempts to escape he was at last successful, and the story, told so simply, and in so unadorned and modest a fashion, compels admiration. Lieutenant Isaacs has the distinction of being the only line officer taken prisoner in the war, and it was probably for this reason that Secretary Daniels honors the book with an introduction, which is enthusiastic and appreciative.

C. L. B.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

"Daisy Miller," and "An International Romance" by Henry James, and "Fairy Tales" and "Poems in Prose" by Oscar Wilde make up two recent volumes of "The Modern Library" (Boni & Liveright). The first tells how a bright and pretty Schenectady maiden of the early seventies shocked Switzerland and Italy by her innocent disregard of the conventions and ended by dying of Roman fever caught while seeing the Colosseum by moonlight. The second is an account of how an Anglo-American marriage of forty years ago was first promoted and then broken off. The stories are slight but remarkably intelligible, being written in the author's early manner which reminds the reader of Howells. The American of the period seems faithfully drawn but the introductory appraisal of James by his friend, W. D. Howells, is certainly overdone. The "Fairy Tales" in Oscar Wilde's little book are clever and witty, but the poetry in the so-called "Poems in Prose" is not of a particularly enrapturing character. Both volumes are pleasantly free from the artificial pose that mars much of the literature these two authors produced.

Theodore Roosevelt wrote the introduction to the verses of thirty-eight American poets on the subject "Victory!" (Small, Maynard Co.) which William Stanley Braithwaite has collected. It must be owned that the "imperishable" lines in the anthology are very meager. The following sonnet, "To Marshal Foch," by Percy Mackaye, justly stands first in the volume:

Magnificent, the hearts of humankind
Exult in joy of this immortal hour
That makes us witness of the awful power
Unleashed of liberty: but deeper-shrined
Than joy our wonder is, that out of blind
Turmoil of peoples, and the twilight glower
Of imminent chaos—pure as Giotto's tower
Poised in the tempest—soars victorious Mind.
Focus of freedom—Foch! Your mind has made
Reason—religion's theme, intelligence—
An anthem rising from the blood-dark sod,
Your brow—a temple where the world has prayed,
Your brain—of myriad souls the single lens:
A burning-glass, held in the hand of God.

Mr. Stephen Leacock's latest book of pleasantries and whimsies, "The Hohenzollerns in America, With the Bolsheviks in Berlin and Other Impossibilities" (John Lane) is made up of

fifteen amusing papers, bearing for the most part on the war, together with a more serious chapter entitled "Fetching the Doctor" which ends the volume. Prominent members of the late Kaiser's family emigrate to this country and try to earn a living here. The journal of the sometime Princess Frederica tells what happens. "Now which of those two pictures is yours and which is Michael Angelo's? I never can tell them apart," the prudent court artist who subsequently received the order of the Red Swan once said to "Uncle William," records the diarist. Among "Some Startling Side Effects of the War" are those which the author has observed in the literary style of papers like the *Spectator*. That sedate weekly, Mr. Leacock assures us, once announced that "Last week's scrap was a cinch for the boys," and the editorial ended thus:

Meantime the mood of the hour should be one, not of undue confidence or boastfulness, but of quiet resolution and deep thankfulness. As the Archbishop of Canterbury so feelingly put it in his sermon in Westminster Abbey last Sunday: "Now that we have them by the neck let us go on in deep and steadfast purpose, till we have twisted the gizzard out of them." The Archbishop's noble words should and will re-echo in every English home.

The author's clever paper on "Heroes and Heroines" should be pondered well by the writers of best-sellers.

The general index to Volume IV of the *Catholic Historical Review* is printed with the April issue of that quarterly. No better testimony could be given to the splendid work done in promotion of the study of the Catholic history of our country than this long list of varied and valuable papers. In the current issue the most interesting topic is perhaps the chapter of the pastoral work in New Jersey (1848-1868) of the late Bishop McQuaid of Rochester, a model historical document of the Rev. Dr. F. J. Zwierlein. It piques anticipation of the book treating of the life of Rochester's famous prelate on which Dr. Zwierlein has been at work for some time. A major part of the issue is devoted to contributions most informative and timely, on the early records of the Spanish Colonies and of California. Under the editorial direction of the Rev. Dr. Charles L. Souvay the second number of the *Catholic Historical Review* has been published by the Catholic Historical Society of St. Louis. The Rev. G. J. Garraghan, S. J., details in this "The Beginning of the St. Louis University," and the Rev. F. G. Holweck tells the story of "Rev. John Francis Regis Loisel," the first priest who was a native of St. Louis (1805-1844). The St. Louis Historical Society was only recently organized, but the results it has already accomplished indicate that the preservation of the local records is now in safe and competent hands.

René Bazin's excellent novel, "The Barrier" (Benziger), which was reviewed in these columns on its first appearance nine years ago, has recently been reprinted. The story centers around a pious French girl with two suitors, an English Protestant and an unbelieving Frenchman. The author shows with great literary skill what worldly sacrifices uncompromising adhesion to the Catholic Faith sometimes costs.—"The Son of Pipo" (Dutton), by C. L. Carlsen, is a study of Filipino life and the difficulties encountered by American teachers in their efforts to lift the people above the tyranny of their native governors, their superstitions and their primitive customs. The narrative centers about a young boy who responds more or less to beneficent influences. The story is mediocre and is disfigured by vulgarity.—"Mockery" (Dodd, Mead), by Alexander McFarland, is a tale of moral cowardice. It is told with a good deal of strength and is a pitiless presentation of disillusionment. There are regrettable scenes in the book, which prevent one from recommending it.

EDUCATION

Senator Smith's Prussian School

SPEAKING in Cincinnati on April 19, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler told his hearers that we are living in an orgy of crooked thinking and false use of language, when "words are twisted from their accustomed meanings, and are used to mislead the public through being given a wrong significance." Dr. Butler was not thinking of the Smith bill, but his words apply exactly to the methods lately employed by several defenders of that Prussian measure. "We do not derive our civil liberty from the Government," continued Dr. Butler, "but we who were in the possession of civil liberty have instituted a government to protect it." Yet, "we are told that the conduct of our daily lives, what we eat and what we drink, the conduct of our business, what we do and gain, must all be under strict governmental control." Rightly does Dr. Butler discern in these dangerous doctrines, the direct path to autocracy. The path will be made immeasurably shorter by placing all educational forces, as the Smith bill ultimately proposes to do, "under strict governmental control." To hold otherwise argues either "crooked thinking", "false use of language", or, most probable of all, a defender of the Smith bill who has never read that charter of Prussianism.

A DANGEROUS MONOPOLY

ALMOST the last place to which one would look for a defense of religious schools, parallel to the public-school system, is the *Baptist World* of Louisville, Ky. Our separated brethren, or the vast majority of them, have been prone to look upon the little red schoolhouse as the sole bulwark of all that is great and good in our civilization, and to regard the parochial school, the only complete religious system in this country, as the chief defender of rum, Romanism and rebellion. Yet writing in the *World* for March 21, W. J. McGlothlin, Ph.D., of Georgetown College, Ky., elaborates an argument for the religious school which, with a few exceptions, admirably presents the Catholic position. Dr. McGlothlin's conclusions are that America to be true to her best interests, must favor the maintenance of a school system parallel with the public schools, and *entirely independent of State control*. The schools of this system must be "in the form of free corporations and of church-supported and controlled institutions," and their graduates should be accorded equal privileges and opportunities with the graduates of the State schools. "Only thus," concludes Dr. McGlothlin, "will our liberties, our spiritual treasures and our place, be safe." Otherwise the civil power will secure a monopoly over education, "and a monopoly over the human mind is the most dangerous of all monopolies." Clearly, the danger is increased tenfold when the monopoly is in the hands of a government, which can and will stifle all criticism or opposition. "Germany," remarks Dr. McGlothlin significantly, "was the first country to try an education that was exclusively the creature of the State." That education developed a narrow, belligerent nationalism. Its goal was simply "the aggrandizement of the State," and because the schools were long conducted for the furtherance of a harsh and bitter militaristic policy, the formation of a cruel and stupid spirit of militarism was the inevitable result.

WEAKNESS OF THE STATE SYSTEM

MORE than once has the danger arising from the establishment in a democracy, of a single, dominant State-supported educational system, been stressed in these pages. The one point of wisdom in the "reverence for the sacredness of individual capacities" theory, so often carried to absurd excesses in our day, was its recognition of the ancient truth that the striking differences of individual from individual are not thrown off by the mere entrance of a child into a classroom. While all children are human beings, and, if normal, will react

normally to the same general processes, yet it remains true that every child is a study in himself. It is therefore good public policy that the State encourage every educational form and system which has proved its worth by actual results, and studiously refrain from any attempt to force all children through a single unyielding mold. The great weakness of the State school, as Dr. McGlothlin well recognizes, is its insistence upon the absolute exclusion from its curriculum of any definite program of religious or moral teaching. "It is naturally and normally temporal and secular" and tends towards "a blank and barren secularism." Yet, surely, the child needs religious instruction quite as much as instruction in spelling or arithmetic.

Of the life to come, man's truest and most perfect existence, of the possibility that there may be a God ruling nations, and exacting allegiance from the individual soul, the secular school refuses to know anything, and to teach anything. At its best, it aims simply to teach boys and girls to make a living, to take an interest, feigned or real, in the things of the mind, and to serve the State. "Liberty of opinion" and "freedom to teach the truth as the truth appears," attributes claimed with smug satisfaction by the advocates of the secular school, are in point of fact, utterly excluded from the secular school. To theories, which, if true, are of the most tremendous importance to the individual as well as to the State, and which, if not true, should be forthwith repressed as hurtful and degrading, it can give no investigation. Technically, at least, it cannot even admit that postulates bearing intimately upon the possibility of an eternal life in a world to come, and man's most sacred duties in this life, have ever been formulated, or that they even exist. Furthermore, even were the truth of these theories and postulates demonstrated by a new open and compelling revelation of the Almighty, the secular school, in accordance with the civil law as it now stands, would be compelled to ignore all. For as Dr. McGlothlin points out, the secular school's highest interest is "good citizenship in a temporal realm." Above this the State school cannot rise.

POINT BY POINT FROM PRUSSIA

"HOW can the world be safe for democracy or for anything else," asks Dr. McGlothlin, "as long as the German educational system remains what it now is?" Through the influence of that system, "glorification of the State has become an obsession, a cult, a religion." But are we acting to make these United States, "safe for democracy," by excavating from the ruins of militaristic Germany, the German school system, rebuilding it through the Smith bill, in every town and city of the country? Point by point, the bill meets the requirements of the German program, accurately described by Dr. McGlothlin:

In Germany, the inherent weakness and dangers of a State system are aggravated by the fact that it has practically monopolized education. . . . While the schools of each State are under the control of that State, the influence of Prussia, the largest and most "efficient" of the German States, is normative for all. . . .

Under the terms of the Smith bill, "influence" is replaced by the "orders" of the Secretary of Education, and these orders are, of course, mandatory, not merely "normative."

Within each State the schools are controlled by a hierarchy of officials extending from the *Kultusminister* down to the smallest school in the realm.

The Smith bill establishes not only a *Kultusminister* under another name, but erects an even larger and more powerful educational hierarchy.

Local people have little influence in their [the schools'] management. Teachers are prepared in State schools, they are selected and licensed by the State, text-books are selected, examinations set, standards determined by the State. The State determines the salary and the conditions under which the teachers shall work, and bestows its honors

and emoluments on the basis of school work. A more efficient instrument for the molding of the national mind in accord with the wishes of the ruling classes can scarcely be conceived.

Except, of course, the Smith bill, which makes the shade of Bismarck gnash its ghostly teeth in envy.

PREPARING FOR BISMARCK

"WORDS are twisted from their accustomed meanings," to quote Dr. Butler once more, "and are used to mislead the people." The propagandists who have now secured a voice in the popular magazines, base their support of the Smith bill on the ground that it will awaken a strong vital devotion to American ideals. It will do nothing of the sort; its effect will be the precise opposite. The whole Smith bill was made in Germany. What the effect of the Prussian program was in Germany, we know, and there is no reason whatever to suppose that the effect will be essentially different in this country. The Smith bill runs contrary to the principles and policies of Americanism as we have known and jealously guarded them for more than a century. It is a direct attack on the essentially American principle of local government of the schools, and on the essentially American practice of encouraging freedom of education.

If a thing to be done by law, cannot be done in accord with the letter and the spirit of the Constitution, it cannot be done at all. The Federal Government has no constitutional right whatever to interfere with the local schools, much less to formulate a program which can issue only in Federal domination. It is not to the point to say, even were it true, that a majority of the States have scandalously neglected their duties towards the schools. The Federal Government can intervene only in the precise instances enumerated in the Constitution, and under the condition there set down. No provision is made for Federal intervention in the conduct of local schools, and therefore no intervention can be taken. This Government is, or once was, a Government of delegated and strictly enumerated powers. If we adopt the Smith bill, let us save our consistency by regarding the Constitution as a scrap of paper, and placing some Bismarckian control at Washington.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

SOCIOLOGY

The Promotion of Citizenship

AS a part of its reconstruction program, the National Catholic War Council is instituting a nation-wide campaign for the promotion of citizenship. It has discarded the term "Americanization" because it is not sufficiently comprehensive. According to the common usage, the term has been interpreted to mean the teaching of English and civics to immigrants. The Council is aware of the fact that illiteracy and neglect of the duties of citizenship are not confined to immigrants. Of the five and one-half million illiterates in the United States in 1910, about fifty per cent were native-born negroes while the remaining fifty per cent was about equally divided between the native-born whites and the foreign-born. Relative to the total number of native whites, the percentage of illiteracy is much greater among them than among the foreign-born.

FUNDAMENTAL DEMOCRACY

THE program of the Catholic War Council emphasizes the fundamental principle that this democracy of ours is a co-operative undertaking. All should be taught that government is not something separate and apart from the people; that it is the duty of each to see that the business of our government is conducted in the interests of all. Every citizen should be made to realize that the defects of government are due in part, at least, to the carelessness and indifference of citizens.

While Catholics respect the voice of the majority in dealing with matters which, as individuals we are unable to solve, it

cannot be too clearly emphasized that there are certain fundamental issues which the majority should not be permitted to decide for us. If the majority should decide to place our religion under ban, if they should insist on making marriage a purely civil ceremony, if they should decide not to respect the sacredness of human life, we could not accept their decision. In other words, Catholics place certain limitations on the sovereignty of the State.

The National Catholic War Council has in preparation a fundamental text on civics in which the various co-operative enterprises of our democracy are explained in a clear and simple manner. This will be supplemented by a short book which will explain the part which great leaders of foreign nationalities have played in the upbuilding of this country. There is scarcely any nationality which has not contributed some great leaders to American life, and nothing pleases the immigrant so much as to feel that his race has made a definite contribution to this country.

VITAL STATISTICS

THERE are five things in which every citizen has a vital interest; these are life, property, income, health and religion. Every man must be taught the value of life, and the necessity of safe-guarding it in every possible way. All should be taught to respect property rights, but they should be made to realize that these are secondary to human rights. It is most important that all possible opportunities for self-improvement be opened to citizens. All should realize the necessity of caring for their health and of the need of striving for more effective health legislation. Religion, of course, should permeate all these activities and give them its highest sanction.

The community center is one of the best means of promoting citizenship. Through the community center the best things in domestic and social economy can be placed at the disposal of the immigrant and backward Americans. The women can be taught the art of conserving and preparing food and of caring for their children according to the best modern standards. In the evening classes conducted in the centers the men can be taught the rudiments of citizenship. The opportunities and different trades can be brought before them, and they can acquire sufficient knowledge of American business institutions to protect themselves against the loan-shark and the swindler.

The National Catholic War Council has already taken steps to organize community centers in a number of the large industrial localities. It is planned to have these centers operated and managed by trained women workers. Trained men will also be employed in each industrial center, whose duty it will be to organize courses in English, citizenship, vocational and business institutes at these strategic points. A certain number of Knights of Columbus Councils and other Catholic organizations have already promised volunteer talent for this work. It will probably be necessary to conduct institutes in the large centers for the purpose of developing local volunteer talent.

JOHN O'GRADY, Ph.D.

NOTE AND COMMENT

When Soldiers May Not Write

RELATIVES and friends of soldiers are often greatly disturbed at present owing to the long silence on the part of the enlisted men. The following statement from the Knights of Columbus may therefore give relief to many distressed souls:

Investigation has proved that the chief obstacle in the way of keeping relatives informed of the whereabouts of soldiers is the order issued that after a soldier starts for a debarkation camp he is not to write and tell his friends when he expects to arrive home. A soldier receiving his debarkation orders thinks he is going home at once, but it frequently happens that he is sent from point to point, and weeks, sometimes months, elapse before he steps aboard a transport homeward bound. But after receiving his first orders he is supposed not to write home. That explains in

many cases the silence which causes a soldier's relatives to worry and fear lest something might have happened to him.

So far the K. of C. Bureau for Missing Soldiers, which is located at 461 Fourth Avenue, New York City, can lay claim to absolute efficiency. It has finally located every soldier and sailor sought, and hopes to maintain this record.

Protestant Defamation of Philippine Catholics

MENTION was made in a recent issue of a cablegram received from China, to the effect that the Catholic missions would be left undisturbed. Word has since then been sent that twelve of the missionaries were deported. They are all Fathers of the Divine Word. To understand the methods employed in Protestant quarters to bring about the banishment from the Philippines of the missionaries of this same Congregation the following article, written by the notorious Campelite minister Hanna and published in the *Ti Dalan Ti Cappia*, will be instructive. It is translated for us from the Ilocano dialect by a Father of this Congregation. The misspelt names are retained as in the original:

The *Daily Bulletin* here at Manila spread the news that the German priests and nuns in Abra are spies of Germany. The Secret Service had found out that the Society which was believed to be holy and which is called "The Society of the Divine Word" is a dirty society, sent and guided by the Department of Spies of Germany to work in all parts of the Orient for the spreading of German interests. Never was there a clearer proof that there are wolves in the clothing of sheep than in the case of the German priests in the Philippines. Through their zeal and fervor for the Roman Catholic Religion, through their leading a poor life, through their continuous hard traveling, they pretended as if they were true ministers of the Word of God; but their hearts were black; they were malefactors, friends of the devil and of Kaiser Wilhelm who wilfully tricked the rich and the poor, the high and the lowly, and even the Government. The engineer Smith of Vigan told the writer of this that he gave money to one of those priests, who had nothing but corn to eat, and told him to buy rice. The priests tell with their mouths that they are poor, and ask the Government for food and for help for their schools, and the riches of Germany were behind them untouched. If the Bishop of Vigan, Rev. Peter Hurth, favored Germany, it was due to the solicitation of the German priests; if the Spaniards and the Irish Jesuit, John Tomkins, were gained over for Germany, it is due, too, to the solicitation of the German priests; for the German priests have worked for four years in the diocese of Vigan and used to visit the Bishop's house and the schools of the Jesuits; they preached in churches and published news praising Germany in the Catholic paper *Aguipadmag* and wrote articles in which they cried down the Public Schools and praised their own schools. If the Archbishop of Manila is a friend of Germany, it is also due to solicitation; for those German priests put up their centre here at Manila, and this could not be unknown to the Archbishop.

The writer of this is of the opinion that the heads of the church here at Manila and at Vigan should be given full forgiveness for the work done by the German priests. Their brethren who steal the clothes of heaven to serve the devil may be reproved and punished. The public must know, not only doubtfully, the feelings of the Roman Catholic Church and of her heads regarding the twofold devilishness found combined in the Society of the Divine Word. Let us hear the words (i. e., explanation) of the Archbishop O'Doherty and of Bishop Hurth.

I heard that under the name of the Archbishop 650,000 pesos (\$325,000), collected by the societies he established, were promised to buy Liberty Bonds with to help defeat the murderer. Will he also be ready to help the Philippines to find out the agents of the Kaiser who have brought contempt on the unstained name of the Holy Word of God and the Roman Catholic Church in the Philippines?

W. R. HANNA.

It has doubtless been noted with what ingenuity the implication of treachery is cast upon the Hierarchy, the Jesuits and the

entire Catholic Church in the Philippines. To give a further semblance of truth to the statements here made, the Fathers of the Divine Word are said to have arrived at the very opening of the war, evidently as emissaries of the Kaiser, whereas in reality they had labored in their province since 1909. The document contains, in spite of its writer's malice, one of the most glowing tributes that could be given to the evangelical life and apostolic labors of these missionaries. They were nevertheless expelled, one of them dying as the result of ill-treatment received by him upon the voyage.

Universities and National Life

COMMENTING upon the relation of the universities of a country to its national life, the New York *Sun* dilates upon the complete lack of influence exerted by any institution of learning in the United States, beyond scattering its alumni throughout the various fields of endeavor. It then passes to the reflection that:

The identification of the university with the national life would seem to be a natural growth where it grows at all. In England, where it is most complete, it has not been forced. The unwisdom of forcing it with instruments of State has been made apparent more than once. The universities of France lost much that they might have given France and the world when Napoleon made them State creatures. Their recovery and present flowering began only when that central national control was relaxed. To what base uses State control may turn the German university of today offers proof. Government control of education is a temptation hard to resist; but to yield to it is to go back, through what bloody nights there is no knowing, to a day behind the Middle Ages. In a democracy it would be to create a self-defeating absurdity.

It is gratifying to note in this editorial comment both the wise rejection of a pernicious Government paternalism and the reference, not to the darkness of the Middle Ages, when university life reached its zenith of development, but rather to the utter night of barbarism which preceded them, amid which the Church again kindled the light of faith and learning that grew into a noonday brightness in the great schools that she created.

Motion-Picture Business and Religion

UNDER the caption, "An Element to be Watched," the following comment appears in the *Classic Motion-Picture Magazine* for May. It is placed among the advisements where moving-picture "producers" may perhaps best hance to find it.

The motion-picture has had much to contend with during its brief career. Between censorship, Sunday closing, unjust taxation, etc., the film business has been kept busy. There is another element slowly creeping in that producers will have to give more thought to—religion. Personally we know of a certain sect that is already planning to form its own producing company and show the production in its own churches. In fact, one play has already been produced. This sect believes that there are elements in the picture business antagonistic to them. The influence of religion has already been felt by several big productions. The figure of "Intolerance" was not due, as some critics claim, to its high-brow theme, but because it "struck" at two prominent religious sects. It was the same with "Joan the Woman." This De Mille production is the only thing that has approached "The Birth of a Nation" for sheer greatness; and it would have been recognized as such throughout the world had not a certain religion risen up against it. It is not presumption. We have actual proof.

The element to be watched by the film company is not a "certain sect," in the gracious words of the writer, but a certain class of producers and exhibitors by whom decency and truth are rated at a purely financial value, and who will be virtuous just so far as it pays them to observe the Ten Commandments. A light has apparently broken somewhere.